DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 398 637 EA 027 808

AUTHOR Ozcan, Mustafa
TITLE Improving Teacher Performance: Toward a Theory of Teacher Motivation.
PUB DATE Apr 96
NOTE 68p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Incentives; Instructional Improvement; Job Performance; *Motivation Techniques; Recognition (Achievement); Rewards; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Motivation

ABSTRACT

Despite a century-long history of teacher-incentive programs in the United States, discovering what matters to teachers and how best to motivate them remains a complex puzzle. This paper features a literature review that investigates the motivational dimension of teacher performance and constructs a theory of teacher motivation. The paper concludes that there is a tendency among teachers to overlook the importance of economic rewards and to overemphasize the importance of intrinsic ones. Some social and normative values affect teachers' attitudes toward economic and psychological rewards. The paper identifies three types of rewards--intrinsic, extrinsic, and means--and offers eight propositions toward a general theory of teacher motivation. Eighteen tables are included. (Contains 149 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 398 637

IMPROVING TEACHER PERFORMANCE: TOWARD A THEORY OF TEACHER MOTIVATION

Mustafa Ozcan, Ph.D.
Clarke College Education Dept.
Dubuque, Iowa 52001
Ph. (319) 588-6680
Email: mozcan@keller.clarke.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Ozcan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, April 8-12, 1996

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 027 808

ABSTRACT

In the United States, there has been concerns about the quality of education and each wave of primary concern has been followed by a reform movement. The latest primary concern about American education emerged in the 1980s and it was suggested in the influential reform reports that teacher salaries should be "professionally competitive, market-sensitive, and performance-based" (National Commission, 1983; The Carnegie Task Force, 1986; The Holmes Group, 1986)

Teacher incentive programs in the form of merit pay plans, and career ladders have a long history in the United States. They have been established to motivate teachers. It is expected that motivated teachers will work hard, teach better, and will ultimately improve the quality of education (Frase, 1992; Bartell, 1987; Johnson, 1986; Ozcan, 1993). However, many attempts to implement teacher incentive programs over the century have failed (Urban, 1985; Johnson, 1984; Murnane and Cohen, 1986). One of the reasons for the failure of these programs is the lack of a sound theoretical base for teacher motivation (Johnson, 1986). Educational leaders and policy makers do not know yet how to motivate teachers. Despite a century long history of the incentive programs, discovering what matters to teachers and how best to motivate them is still a complicated puzzle (Johnson, 1990; Rhodes and Ogawa, 1992; Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993).

The purpose of this study is to investigate the motivational dimension of teacher performance and to construct a theory of teacher motivation including assumptions, concepts, scope conditions, and propositions. To this end, the relevant literature was reviewed under the following three categories: (1) conceptual framework, (2) teacher rewards, and (3) teacher ideas.

As part of conceptual framework, it is assumed that teachers as human beings are naturally motivated to survive, utilize their potential, and realize themselves, and they engage in teaching to earn their rewards and resources. Also as humans, teachers are cultural beings with beliefs and values. The most important two components behind teachers' performance are "interests" and "ideas." "Interests" include every kinds of resources and rewards necessary for their survival and self- realization (Weber, 1978; 1958; Pellion, 1993; Ozcan, 1993). "Ideas" contains knowledge, rules, and norms and can be classified as "beliefs" and "values" (Myrdal, 1962/1944; Westie, 1995).

In the literature, teacher rewards are usually categorized as extrinsic, intrinsic, and ancillary rewards (Lortie, 1975; Johnson, 1986;1990; Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993). In this study, the category of ancillary rewards was excluded and a new reward category, "means rewards," was formulated. All kinds of rewards teaching offers were categorized into three groups as extrinsic, intrinsic, and means rewards, and extrinsic rewards were further divided into economic, honorific, and political rewards.

IMPROVING TEACHER PERFORMANCE: TOWARD A THEORY OF TEACHER MOTIVATION

PROBLEM

In the United States, there has been concerns about the quality of education and each wave of primary concern has been followed by a reform movement. The latest primary concern about American education emerged in the 1980s. The publication of A Nation At Risk in 1983 by the National Commission on Excellence in Education prompted American citizens, politicians, and educators to reform education (National Commission, 1983: 5). A Nation At Risk was followed by a sequence of reform related conferences, symposiums, and reports. The year "1983 saw the publication of an unusual number of reports and studies focused on the shortcomings of schools in the United States" (Howe II, 1984: 1) and after 1983 they continued. In the flurry of these debates, research, and reform proposals, "teachers were perceived to be central to both the problem and the solution" (Johnson, 1986).

One of the requirements to improve the quality of education is the improvement of the quality of teacher performance. It was suggested in A Nation At Risk that teacher salaries should be "professionally competitive, market-sensitive, and performance-based" and "career ladders" should be instituted for teachers (National Commission, 1983: 30-31). The Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986: 12, 23, 32, 55) proposed the establishment of a national board of certification for teachers and stressed the professionalization of the teacher work force. It suggested that school districts "move toward compensation systems" and offer "the pay, autonomy, and career opportunities." The Holmes Group (1986: 23) stressed the importance of teacher training and stated that "the quality of teachers will not be improved unless we improve the quality of their education." This group also proposed the establishment of "a three-tier system of teacher licensing." One of the common suggestions of the reform reports was the establishment of incentive programs for teachers.

Teacher incentive programs in the form of merit pay plans, and career ladders have a long history in the United States. One of the reasons in establishing teacher incentive programs is to motivate current teachers to work hard and teacher better. Teacher motivation, that is, the strength of teachers' willingness to teach, is a significant variable in improving teacher performance. It is expected that motivated teachers will work hard and will ultimately improve the quality of student outcomes (Frase, 1992; Bartell, 1987; Johnson, 1986; Ozcan, 1993). However, many attempts to implement teacher incentive programs over the century have failed (Urban, 1985;

Johnson, 1984; Murnane and Cohen, 1986). Two common reasons identified by researchers for the failure of these programs are the lack of a sound theoretical base and the deficiencies in evaluation (Murnane and Cohen, 1986; Johnson, 1986).

The theoretical base for teacher incentive programs has been generally unspecified. Proponents advanced them as being consistent with proven practices in business and industry, and with some motivation theories (Murnane and Cohen, 1986; Johnson, 1986). In general, expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964; Lawler III, 1983), equity theory (Adams, 1965; Homans, 1961; Weick, 1966), and job enrichment theory (Argyris, 1957; Hackman and Oldham, 1980) provide theoretical support for incentives programs for employees. In the context of teacher motivation, expectancy and equity theories provided justification for merit pay and career ladders, while job enrichment theory supported differentiated staffing and career ladder plans (Johnson, 1986).

The reform proposals to improve teachers' performance motivation which were mostly incentive programs were supported by the Federal Governments of the 1980s (Bell, 1988) and teacher incentives programs were established across the country (Frase, 1992). In fact, an overview of the history of teacher incentive programs suggests that "while interest in paying teachers according to merit endures, attempts to use merit do not." The promise of incentive programs is "dimmed by knowledge" of their history (Murnane and Cohen, 1986). It seems that most of the current incentive programs, like previous ones, will fail in keeping teachers motivated (Johnson, 1986; Murnane and Cohen, 1986). Educational leaders and policy makers do not know yet how to motivate teachers. Despite a century long history of the incentive programs, discovering what matters to teachers and how best to motivate them is still a complicated puzzle (Johnson, 1990; Rhodes and Ogawa, 1992; Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993).

OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this study is to investigate the motivational dimension of teacher performance and to construct a theory of teacher motivation including assumptions, concepts, scope conditions, and propositions. To this end, the relevant literature will be reviewed, a conceptual framework will be determined, and a theory of teacher motivation will be constructed.

METHOD

This study is designed as a comprehensive literature review to synthesize the findings of relevant research in social sciences and propose a theory of teacher

motivation. After an initial review, the relevant literature was divided into three categories as (1) conceptual framework, (2) teacher rewards, and (3) teacher ideas. In the first category, the literature was reviewed to determine the assumptions and concepts of the study which are the "building blocks" of theoretical works. Under this category, both human and employee motivation theories and sociological works about the role of social group(s) and culture(s) in human behavior were reviewed. The goal was to find universal dynamics of human and employee behaviors and utilize them to understand teacher behavior. In the second category, the literature about teacher rewards including qualitative, quantitative and longitudinal studies were reviewed. The goal was to find material and non-material, direct and indirect all kinds of rewards with potential to motivate teachers. Throughout the review process, teacher rewards were divided into five subcategories as economic, political, honorific, psychological, and means rewards. In the third category, the literature about the sources of teacher ideas were divided into three subcategories and the review was focused on teachers' beliefs, values, and evaluation.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Scientific inquiry requires a theoretical framework. A set of assumptions and concepts are necessary to organize the research and make sense of the data. For example, Max Weber (1978), in his study of human society used a theoretical framework to explain and classify human behavior (Kalberg, 1994, p. 36-37). For Weber, sociological investigation begins with the analysis of "internal" and "external" motives behind social action (Weber, 1978, p. 18). Myrdal, in his landmark study, The American Dilemma (1962/1944, p. XXIII, 1027) developed a theoretical framework of human motivation and used it as a base in his study of racial attitude. Following the same tradition, in this study, a conceptual framework will be utilized to understand teacher performance motivation.

In attempting to construct a theory of teacher motivation, teachers should be considered as human beings, employees, and also as decision making practitioners in a unique occupation. To this end, the relevant works in social sciences (Herzberg, 1990; Vroom, 1964; Festinger, 1957; McClelland, 1985; Kalberg, 1994; Maslow, 1943; Coleman, 1990; Weber, 1978; Myrdal, 1962/1944) were reviewed and the following assumptions and concepts were determined.

It is assumed in this study that there are two categories of components behind human behavior. The first category consists of "interests," which can be classified as honorific, religious, political, economic and psychological, and they can be personal, local, and national interests. In this context the term "interests" is used to mean

every kinds of resources and rewards necessary for human beings to survive, utilize their potential and realize themselves (Weber, 1978; 1958; Myrdal, 1962/1944; Peillon, 1993; Ozcan 1993; Collins, 1975, Maslow, 1970). The second category consists of "ideas," which contains knowledge, norms, rules and can be classified as "beliefs" and "values." In this context, the term "ideas" represents cultural-ideal dimension of human life (Myrdal, 1962/1944; Weber, 1978; Ozcan, 1993; Westie, 1995).

People are motivated by the possibilities to earn their personal or societal interests, or to protect them from the perceived menaces (Myrdal, 1962/1944; Weber, 1978; Maslow, 1970; Citrin and Green, 1990; Sears and Funk, 1991; Bobo and Kluegel, 1993; Westie, 1995; 1965). However, interests-based impulses, that is, motivation to act are necessary, but not sufficient for the conduct of human behavior. Humans are cultural beings, that is they are beings with beliefs, and values, and they have the "will" to make choices. Motivated people make their decision to act, or not to act, or for the kinds of action in light of their beliefs and values by considering what is in their best interests or what menaces their best interests most, what is beneficial or harmful for themselves, their families, communities, and nation, or for their students.

In this "interests with ideas" approach to human behavior, both "interests" and "ideas" are considered as the most important two variables behind human behavior and teacher performance as well. There is an intricate interdependence of ideas and interests, yet they are relatively independent. The first impulse for a given action comes from "interests," and "ideas" provide justification and define the situations in which interests are pursued" (Parsons, note: 59, in Weber, 1978: 211). Whether interests or ideas are of greater significance in an action situation depends on the specific context (Bendix, 1946: 520;1977: 46).

Also, human and employee motivation theories provide useful insights for the human and employee characteristics of teachers. Among the theories of human motivation, the assumptions of the growth oriented theories on the nature and orientation of human beings to growth can be utilized as a viable assumption in a theory of teacher motivation (Maslow, 1970/1943). The cognitive dissonance theory of human motivation shows the motivational importance of consistency between the attitudes and behaviors of individuals (Festinger, 1957). Incentive theories provide a satisfactory theoretical ground to use external incentives as motivators (McClelland, 1985; 1953; Skinner, 1953). Exchange theories justify using both rewards and cognitive properties as motivational variables (Turner, 1987). Interaction theories show social and emotional dimensions of rewards and indicate the motives to earn

these rewards in a process of social interaction (Collins, 1986; 1975; 1971) which can address the interaction processes taking place in the classroom.

Among theories of employee motivation, Herzberg's (1990; 1968; 1962) theory provides a safe ground to consider intrinsic rewards as motivators in a work context. Expectancy theories explain relative value of rewards and indicate the importance of the perceived possibility to earn a given reward in motivational processes (Vroom, 1964). Equity theories provide the rational for the argument that if equity is not possible in both "work" and "reward," then individual differences should be accordingly rewarded (Adams, 1975/1965). Goal setting theories have some universal principles which emphasize the linkage between "goal" and "outcome" and "goal" and "ideas" (Locke, 1968).

Social group is another significant factor to be considered to understand human behavior. Individuals with common interests, beliefs and values constitute social groups in society. Assumptions on the nature and functions of social groups are different in different sociological orientations. For Karl Marx, the most important social group is "economic class;" and material-economic values are the dynamic of social action (Marx, 1989). For Durkheim, underlying conditions of social grouping are basically non-material. Individuals with common ideas, interests, sentiments are inevitably attracted toward each other "under the influence of these likenesses." They "seek each other out, enter into relations, associate," and thus a social group is formed (Durkheim, 1933: 26). Max Weber and other scholars in Weberian tradition conceive of society as an arena of competing social groups, each with its own economic, honorific, and political interests and orientation toward the world and human beings (Collins, 1971: 1009). They see occupations as the major basis of social group cultures. For them, occupation "shape people's outlooks. People are more comfortable in associating with others who share the same work situations" (Collins, 1975: 80-82). Individuals are inspired by their social groups and groups are mostly the fountainhead of their beliefs and values (Weber, 1978; Bendix, 1977: 260).

Assumptions

Human beings are naturally motivated to survive and the ultimate end behind human behavior is self-realization, that is using one's capacities to the greatest extent possible. This constant survival and self-realization struggle necessitates material and ideal resources which are obtained by labor ranging from peaceful endeavor to bloody struggle and it occurs in a social context. In the self-realization struggle of human beings, interests in resources and beliefs and values are important determinants of human behavior.

The following are the brief statements of the assumptions of the study:

1. Teachers as human beings are naturally motivated to survive, utilize their potential, and realize themselves.

2. Teachers engage in their occupation to earn their survival and self-realization resources

3. As humans, teachers are cultural beings and live as the members of various social groups.

Concepts

Teacher Rewards

In this study, the terms "rewards," "interests," and "resources" are interchangeably used to express the concept of "interests" as is used in social sciences (Coleman, 1990; Weber, 1978; Collins, 1975). "Interests" is one of the central concepts in social sciences, especially in economics, politics and sociology. It is frequently used with some adjectives, such as "material interests," "ideal interests," "economic interests," "religious interests," "honorific interests," "other worldly interests," and "political interests" and so on. As a broad concept it includes every kind of resources ranging from material benefits to religious salvation relevant to the past, present, and future of human beings (Weber, 1978: 66, 333, 926; 1958: 277, 286; Peillon, 1990: 35-78; Collins, 1975; Coleman, 1990). As a value or potency, an interest may add, satisfy, or maximize the past, present, or future properties of human beings. It may be material or ideal, extrinsic or intrinsic, this worldly or other worldly. It can satisfy physiological needs of individuals, enhance their self-esteem, empower them in political struggle, maximize their social honor, improve their position in the other world, and enrich their overall power to survive, utilize their potential, and realize themselves. In this study, in order to explain the concept clearly and to show its centrality in human motivation, two other interest categories are developed: "multi-interest" and "multi-dimensional interest (MDI)."

The term multi-interest refers to the multiplicity of interests. There are interests in all realms of social life. An interest can be named after the source out of which it originates or after a need which it satisfies. For example, money is an economic interest which may satisfy an immediate economic need or increase existing property. On the other hand, an interest providing other worldly promises may be called "religious," and in the same way, for instance, an interest providing pleasure and joy may be called "intrinsic" or "psychological." In this sense, there are economic interests, political interests, honorific interests, religious interests and so on. There is no exhaustive limit for the number and kinds of the interests. A

plurality of interests, as the potential source of human motivation, and the mainsprings of overall human power surround human life, and each of them has more than one function.

The term multi-dimensional interest (MDI) refers to the multi-functionality of interests. Each interest may simultaneously have various functions. An interest may satisfy a particular need, give a feeling of goodness, or maximize any dimension of overall human power. For example, money as an economic value may be, at first glance, be seen only as an economic resource meeting an economic need, or maximizing economic power. However, in addition to its economic function, money may provide individuals with social prestige, or improve their political power in decision-making contexts (Weber, 1978; McClelland, 1985: 167). In other words, money does not mean only a naked economic potency, but is a multi-dimensional interest. This reasoning can be generalized for all kinds of interests. For instance, an honorific interest does not mean only a source of honor and prestige, it may also provide economic and political power. In the same way, a political interest may provide individuals and groups with more than political power, it can be also a source of economic and honorific power. In this sense, each interest is multi-dimensional, and striving for a particular interest simultaneously implies a desire for more than that particular interest. As result, human beings and teachers as well are naturally oriented to survive, and realize themselves, and to this end, they want to possess relevant resources and rewards which are called "multi-dimensional interests (MDI)" in this study.

Teacher Ideas

Another significant concept behind human behavior is "ideas." It contains knowledge, beliefs, norms and values, and is very instrumental in understanding human behavior (Weber, 1978; Parsons, 1938; Bendix, 1948; Myrdal. 1962/1944). Ideas resemble the tips of iceberg and beneath them there are various other sources. Main sources of ideas are: (1) The culture of society and subcultures of social groups with which individuals identify themselves, such as gender, social class, ethnic, religious, and occupational groups, (2) feedback coming from the assessment and evaluation of personal, social, and professional conduct (Vroom, 1964; Parsons, 1938, Weber, 1978), and (3) individuals themselves, their experience, perception and reasoning.

In the case teacher motivation, (1) teachers' beliefs on children, curriculum, and methods which come from the occupational culture of teachers and education, (2) the feedback coming from the assessment and evaluation of teacher performance, and (3) teachers' values which come from the cultures of social groups with which

teachers identify themselves and they are significant sources of their ideas. It is observed that differences in the sources of ideas are creating differences in the valuations of rewards among teachers (National Education Association, 1967; 1972; 1977; 1982; 1987; 1992; Lortie, 1975; Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993).

As mentioned, human beings have the "will" and "capacity" to take deliberate attitude toward the world, yet they are born within a status group culture. This existing culture, that is a set of ideas, values, and the ways developed by the group to solve their survival and self-realization problems, shapes the characteristics of individuals. People usually take for granted the assumptions and norms of their society even in their most routine behaviors (Bendix, 1977: 266-67). In this study teachers are considered as an occupational group and they are also the members of various other social groups.

Scope Conditions

The proposed theory of teacher motivation in this paper is an interrelated set of assumptions, concepts, and propositions which are advanced by considering some scope conditions. In other words, this theory is applicable under the following conditions: (1) It applies to the teachers who work as employees in K-12 level public schools; (2) it applies to teachers who are the members of a society with market economy, division of labor, and democratic political structure.

In the following sections, the propositions of the proposed theory of teacher motivation and their explanations will be presented. The propositions will be presented under the following rubrics: "teacher rewards and motivation," and "teacher ideas and motivation".

TEACHER REWARDS AND MOTIVATION

Categories of Teacher Rewards

Teaching as an occupation provide teachers with a set of work rewards which can be categorized in various forms, such as material and ideal, extrinsic and intrinsic, or this worldly and other worldly. These are ideal type reward categories which are made to facilitate analysis. In reality, there are no pure reward categories as such and rewards, resources, or interests in each category may have multiple, cross-categorical functions.

Lortie (1975: 101) first classifies teachers' occupational rewards as "extrinsic," "intrinsic/psychological," and "ancillary" rewards, and then he divides extrinsic rewards into three subcategories as "money income," "prestige," and "power over

others." Extrinsic rewards are received or earned from other people or agents. They are extrinsic in the sense that they exist independently of the individuals and have an objective quality. Intrinsic or psychological rewards consist of subjective valuations, they come from the inside of individuals, and they can vary from person to person (Lortie, 1975: 101).

On the other hand, ancillary rewards are defined, as "simultaneously objective and subjective." These rewards "tend to be stable through time, and to be 'taken for granted' rather than specified in contracts" (Lortie 1975: 101) For example, people expect teaching to be cleaner than factory work. Ancillary rewards may be perceived as rewards by some, but for some others they may not be rewarding. For example, "the work schedule" of teaching might be rewarding for married women, but married men may not consider it as a reward. For Lortie, ancillary rewards motivate people to enter an occupation, but career rewards motivate current workers and professionals for active participation and commitment. Ancillary rewards affect the decision of individuals to enter a given occupation rather than their performance. In other words, they are "taken for granted" and the opportunity of earning them does not motivate teachers at work, they are already earned. The ancillary rewards in the sense of attraction to teaching will not be discussed in this study.

In this study, in light of the categorizations of teacher rewards in the literature, a somewhat new categorization is advanced. It is a slightly different version of Lortie's reward categorization. Lortie's extrinsic and intrinsic rewards categories are adopted in the same form, but his category of ancillary rewards was excluded for the reasons explained above, and a new category of teacher rewards, "means rewards," is formulated.

Means rewards in teaching are not by themselves end-rewards usable to meet teachers' survival and self-realization needs. They are necessary means or resources to perform the job, or to better perform the job and earn other end-rewards. They facilitate teachers to teach better and to maximize their prestige, psychological satisfaction, and other work rewards. For example, educational facilities, classroom conditions, teaching materials, neighborhood, and professional growth opportunities are valuable rewards for teachers. In the following subsections, the rewards which teaching offers and opportunities to earn them will be investigated and discussed under three categories: extrinsic rewards, intrinsic rewards, and means rewards. Extrinsic rewards will be also subdivided.

As result, the rewards which teachers expect from teaching are categorized as follows: Extrinsic rewards, intrinsic rewards, and means rewards. Extrinsic rewards

are further divided as economic rewards, honorific rewards, and political rewards. In other words, all kinds of rewards which are vital for the survival and self realization of teachers, and teachers expect them from their occupation can be categorized under the following five rubrics: (1) economic, (2) honorific (3) political, (4) psychological, and (5) means rewards. In this section, each category will be separately discussed.

Extrinsic Rewards and Motivation

Extrinsic rewards originate outside individuals, exist independently, and are objective valuations. Extrinsic rewards are objective resources and values; regardless of the subjective perceptions of individuals, they objectively exist. They might be material and economic resources, social and cultural goods, respect and recognition, or political and professional power. They are received from other people, agencies, or resources. In business and industry, they are frequently used as incentives (Herzberg, 1990). In social sciences, they are usually classified as economic benefits, social honor-prestige, and political-professional power (Collins, 1975; Peillon, 1990). The same classification is frequently made for the extrinsic rewards of teachers (Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993; Lortie, 1975; Johnson, 1990).

The review of literature reveals that there is a tendency among teachers to overlook and de-emphasize the importance of extrinsic rewards (Lortie, 1975: 82-108; Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993: 58; Johnson, 1990: 288-89; Lieberman and Miller, 1984: 2, 11; Goodlad, 1984: 173; Sarason, 1970). However, in modern society with division of labor, occupational specialization and market freedom, individuals engage in occupations to produce some specific goods and services, and exchange them with some other kinds of utilities, services, resources, or rewards. Among these resources, extrinsic rewards occupy a substantial place and are necessary for human survival and self-realization.

As mentioned, the rewards teachers expect from teaching can be categorized into five groups and most of them are extrinsic rewards by nature. Despite the argument of the primacy of intrinsic rewards in teaching (Lortie, 1975: 104) it can be argued that in modern society, in the context of career rewards expected from occupations, the importance of extrinsic rewards is not less than the importance of psychological ones. The literature shows that teachers rarely leave teaching for the lack of psychological rewards; but they leave teaching for the insufficiency of extrinsic rewards such as economic income, prestige, and power (Lortie, 1975; Johnson ,1990).

To consider teaching as an occupation producing mostly psychological satisfaction and teachers as the hunters of intrinsic rewards is not readily acceptable and also has misleading implications. This anomaly will be further discussed later. In the following section each subcategory of extrinsic rewards will be separately reviewed.

Economic Rewards and Motivation

Lortie (1075: 104) in his survey of public school teachers in 1964, subdivided teachers' extrinsic rewards into three subcategories and asked teachers to choose the one from which they derive the most satisfaction. One of the subcategories was "The salary I earn in my profession" which stands for economic rewards. The other two extrinsic reward subcategories were "The respect I receive from others," and "The opportunity to wield some influence." Also there was one "No satisfaction" choice. As seen in Table 2, only 14.3 percent of teachers chose "the salary" as their satisfaction source. It is the third largest proportion after the alternatives "the respect" and "the influence."

In 1984, Kottkamp and his colleagues replicated Lortie's survey in Dade County public schools, Florida. They asked the same question of extrinsic reward subcategories. As seen in Table 2, the proportions of teachers' responses with regard to the economic rewards are almost the same in 1964 and 1984. In other alternatives there are significant changes, but in the salary option there is a slight decline. In 1984, 14.2 percent of teachers chose the alternative, "The salary" as their most satisfying extrinsic reward which had been chosen by 14.3 percent of teachers in 1964 (Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993: 58).

Lortie also discussed the issues of economic rewards with teachers in his Five Town interviews in 1964. Teachers were asked the question, "What do you think you lose by being a teacher rather than in some other occupation?" In answering this question male and female teachers differed in their selection. Among male teachers, 59 percent said the cost of teaching for them was "inadequate money income." However, among female teachers only four percent referred to low salaries (Lortie, 1975:96,252).

In Lortie's interviews there was another question relevant to economic rewards. He asked teachers, "Can you think of any changes which might increase your satisfaction with teaching as an occupation?" As seen in Table 9, "More money, promotion" is the most mentioned item by teachers as the source of their satisfaction (Lortie, 1975: 183, 252).

The National Education Association (NEA) has conducted surveys on the status of American public school teacher every five years since 1956. These surveys provide data on the professional and personal characteristics of teachers. The NEA surveys also include some questions relevant to teacher rewards and motivation.

In the last three surveys of the NEA, conducted since 1981[1] , teachers were asked the question, "What are the three main reasons you are presently teaching?" In this question teachers were given 21 alternatives and asked to mark three main reasons for which they keep teaching. Three of these 21 alternatives are directly related to economic rewards: "Financial rewards," "Need for second income," and "Need for income after termination of marriage." As seen in Table 3, different proportions of teachers chose different economic reward alternatives at different times. For example, there is a decline since 1981 in the proportions of teachers who chose "Need for second income" as one of their three main reasons to keep teaching. In 1981, 1986 and 1991, 17.5, 17,1 and 14.0 percent of teachers chose respectively the alternative of need for second income. In the proportions of teachers choosing the alternative "Financial rewards," there is a similar decline. It was chosen in 1981, 1986 and 1991 by 9.8, 5.9 and 6.4 percent of teachers respectively. The third economic reward related alternative, "Need for income after termination of marriage" was chosen by small proportions of teachers. In 1981, 1986 and 1991 it was chosen 2.7, 3.1 and 3.0 percent of teachers respectively (NEA, 1982; NEA, 1987; NEA, 1992).

Johnson (1990) asked teachers questions about their economic rewards. It seems that in the responses of teachers to the question of whether or not "teaching has been the career that they once anticipated," there is a bifocal accumulation with regard to the extrinsic-economic rewards and intrinsic satisfaction. Teachers said that they experienced "tremendous satisfaction in their work with children," but their teaching careers have also been "frustrating and disappointing." Some teachers stated that they are proud to be a teacher; their job "centers around a fascination with kids." They like "the way five-year-old minds work;" they "love instructing," they "love the give and take," and so on (Johnson, 1990: 40-43). There is an obvious "rapture" in their responses. However, this is not the whole picture. They also talk about their disappointment which is mostly related to the extrinsic rewards and economic income.

---

[1]The National Education Association has surveyed teachers since 1961, however its questionnaire has been modified several times and the question relevant to teachers' honorific rewards has been applied since 1981.

The type of dissatisfaction teachers experience in their work is almost the same. Johnson noted a considerable agreement among teachers. The teachers in her sample spoke of having "few rewards" beyond those gained from children. They "repeatedly cited low salaries" as one of the most frustrating features of their work. One teacher says "I am not real happy about the money." The same teacher also states that she likes teaching. Another teacher admits that there are days "when I am honestly angry that I have chosen this" occupation. This teacher explains that "a lot of" her frustration "has to do with money" (Johnson, 1990: 43).

Both public and private school teachers report frustration and disappointment regarding teaching and economic income. For example, one public elementary school teacher says, "I get a lot of love from the kids I teach. I really feel that I have the possibility to make a difference in somebody's life, which to me is worth more than money" (Johnson, 1990: 42). That statement gives the impression that this teacher is an idealist who does not care about extrinsic resources, but rather about psychological rewards. However, the same teacher continues to speak and complain about the insufficiency of "the money," "the prestige," and "the autonomy" teaching offers. At the end of the statements the teacher stresses again the importance of what the kids give to him.

In modern societies with division of labor, people engage in occupations to earn their survival and self-realization sources. Teaching is the occupation of teachers. They spend their material, social, and psychological potential to perform their occupation and to produce a socially valuable service. In return, they expect, or are supposed to expect, the rewards necessary for their survival and self-realization.

Since teachers' survival and self-realization rewards include economic resources, it can be reasoned that economic rewards are important to them. However, the literature reveals that in the case of economic rewards, the research findings are not consistent with the above reasoning. In many cases, teachers themselves stated that economic rewards are not important to them (See Tables 1 and 2).

To understand the attitude of teachers toward the economic rewards their preferences should be evaluated in light of some normative considerations. As seen in the literature, teachers de-emphasize the importance of extrinsic-economic resources, despite the necessity of these rewards in their survival and self-realization struggle. This situation is an anomaly and its possible reasons might be as follows: First, because of the prevailing social values which favor service to society over the pursuit of personal extrinsic rewards (Lortie, 1975), teachers cannot express their real ideas. In a society with normative values, such as American society,

declaring the intention to pursue extrinsic rewards is not a prestigious, socially favored behavior (Lortie, 1975). However, an idealistic statement declaring an intention to serve others is a prestige gaining disposition. Since there is no reward in declaring their pursuit of economic income, it is reasonable to expect teachers to consciously or unconsciously conceal their real thoughts of extrinsic-economic rewards. They can protect their prestige and even earn prestige by concealing their concerns of economic rewards but expressing their other concerns such as educating children and serving the society.

Second, teachers prefer respect and power more than salary (see Table 2). However, as documented in the literature (Rury, 1989; NEA, 1992), they are members of middle or lower-middle classes; they do not come from wealthy families. A substantial proportion of them work in a second job (see Table 4). Also their salaries are consistently less than the salaries of other college graduates holding similar positions (see Table, 5). Under these conditions, one wonders how they can receive respect from others and possess power to influence decision making processes without having economic power. The dynamic behind this preferences might be the desire to protect their self-esteem. For teachers to prefer respect and influence can mean they care about the respect received from students and being influential on them. Also, to prefer respect and influence and to create an influential and respectful teacher image is more rewarding than creating a teacher image striving for money or somebody in need of money (Johnson, 1990: 301-321; Murnane, Singer, Willett, Kemple, and Olsen, 1991).

Third, in a society with normative values, current research methods and instruments used to measure the attitude of teachers might be inappropriate. In a society which favors serving the society and pursuing intrinsic rewards, interview, or traditional survey methods may not be appropriate to discover teachers' attitudes of extrinsic rewards. It can be argued that in a social environment such as, in a face to face interview, teachers should not be expected to declare everything they think.

Also the concepts of "self-ascribed" and "other-ascribed" motivations can be helpful to understand the reasons behind teachers' attitude of economic rewards. The data gathered from the teachers support the argument that "normative inhibitions reduce teachers' readiness to include material benefits among the major attractions." For example, when teachers were asked "why other teachers were in the occupation," the rank of importance of material benefits as a reason increases in their responses (Lortie, 1975). In other words, when teacher were asked, "to project motivations onto unnamed others rather than to talk about themselves," and their responses were compared, it appears that there are "provocative differences in the

distribution of self-ascribed and other-ascribed motivations" (emphasis added). In the comparison of self-ascribed and other-ascribed responses, "the most striking difference (...) refers to material benefits." In the projective, that is, other-ascribed item, material benefits are mentioned more than that of self-ascribed question. If the general category of material benefits is subdivided to accommodate the more frequently mentioned rewards. The results show that in the other-ascribed question each single benefit elicits different but more frequent mentions than the mentions of all material benefits in the self-descriptive question (Lortie, 1975: 31).

Although there are no sufficient empirical data gathered from teachers and suggesting that economic rewards are important to teachers, it is a common place observation that economic rewards are vital in satisfying teachers' survival and self-realization needs, and there is not any teacher who teaches without receiving economic rewards. As discussed above, it is likely that the reasons behind the attitudes of teachers which de-emphasize the importance of economic rewards are mostly normative and social. In light of this discussion it is safe to state that economic rewards are important to teachers and the opportunities to earn economic rewards motivate teachers. It is proposed that the greater the opportunities to earn economic rewards, the greater will be teacher motivation.

Honorific Rewards and Motivation

One of the properties of social life is honor. Human beings would like to be recognized, respected, and honored. Individuals seek opportunities to earn honor and occupations are the ways to develop a respected personal image in society.

Teachers as members of a society and practitioners in an occupation would like to be recognized and respected. Furthermore, regardless of their desire, teaching requires teachers to be respectable persons. In this section the literature relevant to the honorific rewards of teachers will be reviewed. The terms honor, prestige, and recognition will be interchangeably used to express the concept of social honor.

Social honor, prestige, or recognition is categorized as an extrinsic reward. It is extrinsic by nature because it comes not from the inside of individuals, but outside sources and people. In the case of teachers, the literature shows that the sources which honor teachers most commonly are students, parents. administrators, and colleagues. Teachers expect these people to recognize, verify, and honor their work (Johnson, 1990: 290-300; Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993: 105-111; Lortie, 1975: 10-13; The NEA, 1992).

In Johnson's research, teachers expressed the importance of prestige to them. Their statements also reveal what teachers understand from being recognized and

honored. Teachers in these interviews usually complain that teaching is short on recognition. They mostly look to others for reassurance about merits of their work and among others students are important. Some teachers stated that they were rewarded by seeing kids' progress and realizing how influential they could be with them. A teacher explains the importance of students' recognition as follows: "I know I am good. I know by what the kids tell me, by what they produce for me and by what they do not produce for other teachers" (Johnson, 1990: 291). Another teacher states that receiving a card from a student is something very important, because students "really know what you are doing or what you are not doing; they are the authorities." Several other teachers mentioned that receiving cards or notes from students at the close of the school year was an important indication of students' respect and recognition.

Former or graduated students are also a source of recognition for teachers. Students who come back months or years after leaving their classroom provide teachers with encouragement and recognition. Teachers say that if former students remember them respectfully, if they are doing well in the life, these give them pleasure. For example, a middle school teacher recalled of encountering one of her former students. This student had told her that she was the best teacher he ever had. The teacher said that "the things like that make the whole thing worth." Teachers value the remarks of their former students who are successful in college or in life (Johnson, 1990: 292).

Parents are another source of honorific rewards for teachers. Teachers look to parents for recognition of their success with students. If parents say that their children are happy in school, this makes teachers happy. In Johnson's interviews, a teacher said that "I love to hear" a parent who says that his child "cannot wait to school, that makes my day" (Johnson, 1990: 293). In the same interviews several teachers mentioned that they like it when parents request their children be placed in their classes. For example, an elementary school teacher said that her "best recognition" was "parents who line up their families because they like what you did with their brothers and sisters (...). That is rewarding." Another elementary school teacher stated that it was nice if parents come in and want you to have their other child. "I enjoy" these kinds of things; "I am not sure it is better than money," but "it makes me feel good," she said (Johnson, 1990: 293). Some other teachers mentioned that "parents' written notes of thanks were potent sources of praise" for them. An elementary school teacher stated that they were signs of sheer appreciation for the things they do. A middle school teacher commented that there was nothing "more wonderful than getting a letter from a parent" (Johnson, 1990: 293).

Another source of recognition emphasized by teachers in Johnson's interviews is administrators. Both elementary and secondary school teachers mentioned their administrators, mostly principals, as the source of their honorific rewards. An elementary school teacher said that his principal was giving them a lot of recognition. He said the principal sometimes "just pats you on the back, just telling you that you are doing a heck of a job." In the same interviews a middle school teacher explained her thought by saying that there were not a lot of ways of recognizing good teaching, but her principal was good at it. She said, the principal "has made me feel very good about myself as a teacher." The statements of teachers in Johnson's interviews reveal that teachers like to be praised and principals usually praise them in the course of work rather than on formal occasions. For example, a teacher said that her principal had praised her to another administrator in an occasional conversation for her doing an assigned duty. This teacher felt that she was "gratified" by this recognition. She said that "that kind of thing makes me want to do other things. If I did not have the praise and good feedback, I might not be as enthusiastic as I am about doing other things." Another teacher who was pleased with the recognition in her school credited her principal with the following statement: "She comes around and she compliments, she openly compliments people at staff meetings on what she saw in the classroom or in the hall" (Johnson, 1990: 294).

Besides the oral appreciation statements, teachers also like to receive notes of appreciation from their administrators for their individual efforts. One teacher explains the kind of recognition he received from his principal as follows:

> It is personal recognition. Kind words. It is kind words as in 'You did a hell of job, that was really great. Thanks a lot. I really appreciate it.' You come home and you find a thank-you card, and a gift certificate to a local restaurant, a note that says, 'Take your family out to dinner.' I know damn well that came out of his own pocket (Johnson, 1990: 295).

Some teachers stated that for them recognition came in the form of their principal's support for new programs that they wanted to try. Some other teacher said that they felt recognized when their principals appointed them to influential committees. Several other teachers mentioned that their principals recognized good work by asking for their advice or involving them in policy making (Johnson, 1990: 295). Teachers think that if their opinions are asked, it means that they are recognized and respected.

For teachers, another source of recognition and prestige is their colleagues. They look to their peers for recognition and reassurance. In Johnson's interviews most of the teachers stated that they felt encouraged by their colleagues who ask their advice or use their methods and ideas. For example, one of the teachers said that she was heartened when other teachers came and said "I am coming to you because I know you know how to do this." Several teachers described similar responses from her colleagues as compliments. Another teacher said she valued the compliments and even questions of other teachers as an indication of recognition. Teachers also liked the compliments of colleagues who taught their students in subsequent grades and praised them for preparing those students well (Johnson, 1990:296).

Lortie (1975) investigates the honorific rewards of teachers as a subcategory of teachers' extrinsic rewards. His data collected through surveying and interviewing with public school teachers reveal that teachers consider "respect from others" as their most important extrinsic reward. As seen in Table 2, in Lortie's 1964 survey, 36.6 percent of public school teachers in Dade county, Florida, chose "respect from others" among three clusters of extrinsic rewards (Lortie, 1975: 105).

Lortie (1975: 10-12) defines the teacher's social position as "special but shadowed." For him, teaching occupies a special but shadowed social standing. As an occupation it is honored by society, but the real regard shown those who teach does not match the professed regard. Lortie tries to explain the reasons behind the low prestige of teachers. For him, one reason is that teaching became work performed by young women in the nineteenth century; the low social position of the young and the female in society reduced the social rank of teaching.

Lortie (1975: 130) indicates "the paucity of honorifics" available to teachers. According to his observations, teachers rarely receive overt honors for their achievements. In his Five Town interviews, some teachers referred to events which brought recognition. These prestige-giving events mentioned by teachers reveal teachers' perception of honorific rewards and its sources. As recognition, teachers mentioned "compliments from superordinates, mentions in the local newspaper, appointments to special committees, receiving a fellowship, or being invited to teach on closed-circuit television." Teachers also mentioned students and parents as the source of their honorific rewards. For example, teachers feel gratified if they receive a gift from students, or if students prepare a party for them. Also they said they are pleased if parents want to get their younger children in their class.

In 1984, Kottkamp, Provenzo, Cohn, and McCloskey replicated Lortie's research of 1964, and found different results from those of Lortie with regard to the honorific

rewards of teachers (Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993; Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn, 1986). They used many of Lortie's survey and interview questions to explore the changes in teachers' attitudes of work rewards through comparing the findings of the two studies (Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993: XVI-XVII; Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn, 1986). As previously noted, in Lortie's research, teachers were asked to choose the most satisfying extrinsic reward from a cluster and the largest group, 36.6 percent, had chosen the alternative, "The respect I receive from others," as their satisfaction source. After 20 years, in Kottkamp and his colleagues' study, teachers were asked the same question. As seen in Table 2, the preference of teachers with regard to respect received from others changed significantly. In 1984, 26.3 percent of teachers chose "the respect received from others" as their most satisfying extrinsic reward. However, in 1964, the public school teachers working in the same school district had been asked the same question and 36.6 percent of them had chosen the same alternative (Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993: 58; Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn, 1986). Although the percentage of teachers choosing "respect from others" as the most important source of satisfaction declined 10.3 percent from 1964 to 1984, a substantial proportion of teachers, 26.6 percent, chose it again in 1984. There is another replicated question relevant to respect and the comparison of their findings reveals an increase in the percentage of teachers who emphasize the importance of respect. As seen in Table 6, teachers were asked the characteristics of students they prefer to teach. In 1984, 46.6 percent of teachers preferred to teach respectful students, while in 1964, 36.2 percent of teachers had chosen the same alternative; the increase is 10.4 percent in 20 years.

The National Education Association (NEA) surveys teachers periodically. In the questionnaire used by the NEA there is no question directly addressing honorific rewards of teachers. However, in one of the questions in the survey, there is an alternative in which the value of education in society is considered as a reward for teachers. The question is "What are the three main reasons you are presently still teaching." One of 21 alternatives under this question is "value or significance of education in society." Since this alternative is relevant to teacher recognition and prestige, the responses to it can be used in discussing teachers' honorific rewards. Though the NEA surveys conducted since 1956 once every five years, this alternative was asked of teachers since 1981. In this question teachers are asked to mark three main reasons for which they keep teaching among 21 alternatives. As seen in Table 3, the alternative, "Value or significance of education in society," which reflects the prestige of teaching and of the honorific rewards is important to teachers. Teachers emphasize the value of education in society as a reason which keeps them in

teaching. In 1982, 37.6 percent of teachers, the third largest proportion chose "value or significance of education." In other words they meant that the value of education is the third important reason which motivates them to stay in the occupation. In 1986, the same alternative was chosen by 34.4 percent of teachers, that was again the third largest proportion, and in 1991, 41.7 percent of teachers, the second largest proportion, chose the same alternative, "Value or significance of education in society," as one of the reasons keeping them in the occupation (NEA, 1992: 62).

For teachers, honorific rewards mean compliments, praising comments, and respect from students, parents, administrators, and colleagues. These forms of recognition accumulate over time and constitute a teacher's reputation. The literature review reveals that teachers would like to be recognized and respected. In the interviews, teachers clearly indicate that the respect and recognition are the greatest rewards, they receive from their work. (Johnson, 1990: 44, 158, 296, 297).

In surveys conducted at different times it was found that teachers consider "The respect received from others," as their most important satisfaction source which addresses the honorific rewards of teachers (see Table 1). Teachers also consider "The value or significance of education in society," as one of the main reasons which keeps them in teaching (see Table 3). Also the results of honorific rewards of research conducted through interviews are consistent with the results of the surveys (Lortie, 1975; Johnson 1990).

In light of the available research relevant to the honorific rewards of teachers, it can be stated that honorific rewards are important to teachers and opportunities to earn them motivate teachers. It is proposed that the greater the opportunities to earn honorific rewards, the greater will be teacher motivation.

Political Rewards and Motivation

The issue of giving teachers decision making power or making them subject to a set of specifications is being debated since the beginning of the century (Johnson, 1990: 7). In the 1920s and 1930s, educational leaders took some concepts and principles from business and scientific management and attempted to reorganize teaching. The factory became the model for good management and "efficiency, rationality, continuity, precision, and impartiality" became underlying concepts for the overall orientation (Tyack, 1974: 28). Callahan (1964: 95) describes this movement as follows:

> In the years between 1911 and 1925 educational administrators responded in a variety of ways to the demands for more efficient

> operation of the schools. Before the mania ran its course various 'efficiency' procedures were applied to classroom learning and to teachers (...). Most of these actions (...) were connected in some way by educators to the magic words 'scientific management' (Callahan, 1964: 95).

Leaders of this movement considered teachers as similar to factory workers. For them, teachers are agents charged with implementing detailed specifications developed in central headquarters (Callahan, 1964: 95-97; Lortie, 1975: 5).

Workers on an assembly line do specialized assignments. In manufacturing a product they become experts at particular subtasks. In the same way, in a school modeled after a factory, teachers would be experts in different areas such as computer, phonics, scientific inquiry, and so on. Students would move from "one expert worker to the next to be informed, treated, and tested" until they graduate. Teachers "would repeat routine, predetermined tasks rather than adapt their approaches to changing students" (Johnson, 1990: 119).

The characteristics of teachers' tasks and the technology of teaching determine some basic features of teaching as an occupation. Teachers work with humans who are not "simple or uniform widgets," but varied, complex, and changing beings. Teachers do not teach as Johnson says "right brain learners or deductive reasoners," but various topics at various levels to all, and their activities are partially specialized. Johnson indicates the necessity of decision making power for teachers as follows.

> As a result of both the variety of students and teaching's relatively unspecified technology teachers must exercise discretion in their work. Autonomy, whether intentionally granted by superiors or necessarily seized by teachers behind the classroom door, is a central feature of their work (Johnson, 1990: 5).

The concept of teacher power has several dimensions. In one aspect, it is a "means" for teacher in their survival and self-realization struggle. For example, teachers engage in teaching as their occupation and expect to earn a set of rewards including social and political power. However, in the context of teaching, the concept has a different dimension. Teachers use their professional power or authority as the means to make decisions relevant to teaching. Research shows that teachers desire to modify the given material and add something personal to their teaching.

According to Lortie's study, teachers prefer decision making freedom to organizational rules. In his research, teachers were asked to choose between "more freedom from organizational authority and greater efficiency through rules." For Lortie (1975: 111, 164) the results were "clear-cut: 66 percent chose greater freedom,

29 percent prevailing arrangements, and four percent more rules and efficiency." He interprets these results by saying that "if anything, these teachers want to loosen organizational claims in favor of teacher decision making in the classroom."

Johnson' research shows that teachers like to be involved in the departmental level decision making processes. The reason motivating them to be involved in these processes is that the decisions which are made at this level are more relevant to classroom instruction which is a source of rewards for teachers. For example, the decisions about elective offerings, course sequence, or scheduling are made at this level. For Johnson, teachers are encouraged to be involved in decision making at this level because they feel confident that decisions they make with their peers will be implemented (Johnson, 1990: 184).

In Lortie's survey, another question relevant to teachers' authority produced similar results in which teachers emphasized the importance of decision making power in the classroom. In this case, teachers were given three alternatives relevant to the policy of school district where teachers worked and asked to indicate their preference. The majority of respondents, 66 percent, chose "greater freedom for teachers," 29 percent chose "prevailing arrangements," and four percent chose "more rule and efficiency." The results imply that teachers want to loosen organizational control in favor of their decision making power in the classroom (Lortie, 1975: 164, 256).

In 1984, twenty years after Lortie's study, Kottkamp, Provenzo, Cohn, and McCloskey replicated Lortie's survey. With regard to teachers' authority they asked the same questions of teachers in the same school districts. As previously mentioned, in Lortie's survey of 1964, 36.0 percent of teachers chose "the opportunity to wield some influence" as their most important extrinsic reward. According to the results of the replicated study of 1984, the percentage of teachers who chose the same alternative, "The opportunity to wield some influence" as their most important extrinsic reward dropped from 36.0 to 31.7 percent. However, as seen in Table 2, since the percentages of teachers who chose other alternatives also dropped, 31.7 percent of teachers is still the largest group. In other words, in the 1984 survey, the largest group of teachers chose power to influence as their most important extrinsic reward (Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993: 58; Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn, 1986).

Since the nature of teaching requires its practitioners to make decisions, teachers in the classroom are naturally authorized to make decisions. They can be considered as both decision makers and practitioners. Although teachers are naturally given authority to make decisions in practicing teaching, since teaching is a collective enterprise, they are not completely free in exercising their professional

authority. The objectives of teaching which determine the characteristics of expected educational outcomes are given to teachers by society. In other words, teachers are given the objectives and held responsible for the production of the desired outcomes. In this design there is a multiplicity of processes which require teachers to make decisions and apply them to produce the expected outcome. Teachers want to have the power to choose their teaching materials, methods, and strategies, and are responsible for the outcome. This power gives them "a sense of ownership" in what they are doing which is an important component in work motivation (Beck 1983). To motivate teachers teaching needs to be designed to allow them to exercise professional power and to be personally or jointly responsible for their work so that the job can provide them with a sense of ownership of their work and outcomes (Beck, 1983: 396).

Decision making power or political rewards of teachers is a subcategory in teachers' extrinsic rewards and literature shows that teachers value power. In the surveys, teachers choose the alternative addressing their political rewards at highest levels (see Table 2). In light of the research findings and the relevant discussions, it can be stated that decision making power in determining teaching policies, that is, political power, is important to teachers. Opportunities to earn authority and decision making power and develop a sense of ownership of teaching motivate teachers. It is proposed that the greater the opportunities to earn political rewards and develop a sense of ownership of teaching, the greater will be teacher motivation.

Intrinsic Rewards and Motivation

In this study, the terms "intrinsic rewards" and "psychological rewards" are used interchangeably to address work-related internal satisfaction of teachers. Intrinsic rewards are subjectively felt by individuals within themselves. They might be called joy, pleasure, or psychological satisfaction. The degree of intrinsic rewards are subject to the personal characteristics of individuals as well as the nature of work. The value and amount of psychological rewards may change from person to person, from occupation to occupation. Some occupations may offer frequent opportunities to earn psychological rewards but some others may not.

Lortie (1975: 101) argues that the "cultural and structural aspects" of teaching influence teachers to emphasize psychological rewards in their work. The organization of career rewards in teaching fosters "a present-oriented rather than future-oriented" approach to rewards. The effort of individual teachers can increase their task-related satisfaction. In other words, the psychological rewards of

teachers, the teachers' enjoyment of their work, can be changed by teachers themselves. Therefore, most teachers, according to Lortie emphasize rewards they can earn in the present and for which they strive. Lortie, under the title of "The Primacy of Psychic Rewards" asserts that, "teachers consequently tend to concentrate their energies at points where effort may make a difference" (Lortie, 1975: 101-102). For Lortie, since teachers know that their decisions and practices can make a difference in the amount of psychological rewards they will earn, their work can influence the flow of intrinsic rewards, they concentrate their effort on the acquisition of them.

Lortie supports his argument of the primacy of intrinsic rewards with empirical data. He notes that in his Five Town interviews of 1964, the major tendency of teachers was to connect their rewards with classroom events. The respondents fused the idea of work gratification and the idea of work goals. For these teachers, deriving satisfaction from their work and reaching classroom objectives were almost the same. In answering questions related to satisfaction they received from teaching, the majority of them cited task-related outcomes. For example, in the responses of teachers to an interview question about the preferred rewards in teaching, 125 mentions were coded as intrinsic reward references out of 135. On a follow up question, with four exception, all responses were connected with work outcomes. The major emphasis in the responses to the questions was that "satisfaction accompanied desirable results with students," and "respondents experienced gratification when they felt they had influenced students" (Lortie, 1975: 103-104).

Lortie in his survey of public school teachers in Dade County, Florida, in 1964, found similar results to those of the Five Town interviews with regard to the intrinsic rewards of teachers. As previously mentioned, teachers were asked to select one of the three statements, addressing teachers' extrinsic, intrinsic, and ancillary rewards. According to survey results, as seen in Table 1, 76.5 percent of teachers chose the statement describing teachers' intrinsic rewards: "The opportunities to study, plan, master classroom management, 'reach' students, and associate with colleagues and children." Of the rest of the teachers, as previously mentioned, 11.9 percent chose the extrinsic rewards, and 11.7 percent chose the ancillary rewards as their most important reward (Lortie, 1975: 104).

In the same survey Lortie asked teachers another question which particularly addresses teachers' intrinsic rewards. Teachers were given alternative statements describing intrinsically rewarding situations and asked to select the most important one. As seen in Table 7, the results show that responses "piled up" under the

alternative, "The times I know I have 'reached' a student or group of students and they have learned," which can be summarized as "reaching students." The majority of teachers, 86.2 percent, chose this alternative. The percentages of teachers choosing the other alternatives are as follows: 7.9 percent chose the alternative, "Chance to associate with children or young people and to develop relationships with them;" 3.4 percent chose the alternative, "The opportunity teaching gives me to study, read, and plan for classes;" and 1.2 percent chose the alternative, "The chance it offers to develop mastery of discipline and classroom management," (Lortie, 1975: 105,195).

In 1984, Kottkamp and his colleagues, replicated Lortie's survey questions relevant to the teachers' intrinsic rewards. There are some differences among the proportions of teachers choosing the same alternative in 1964 and 1984. In the responses to the question asking teachers to choose the most important reward category from the cluster of extrinsic, intrinsic, and ancillary rewards, there is a decline in the proportion of teachers who chose intrinsic rewards. As seen in Table 1, in 1984, 70.2 percent of teachers chose the intrinsic rewards, "The opportunities to study, plan, master classroom management, 'reach' students, and associate with colleagues and children." The same alternative had been chosen by 76.3 percent of teachers in 1964. Although, there is a decline, the largest proportions of teachers in both 1964 and 1984 chose the intrinsic rewards as the most important reward category to themselves (Lortie, 1975: 104-105; Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993: 58-61; Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn, 1986).

Kottkamp and his colleagues replicated Lortie's another question relevant to teachers' intrinsic rewards, in which, as mentioned, Lortie had divided the category of intrinsic rewards into some subcategories and asked teachers to mark the most satisfying alternative. As seen in Table 7, in 1984, "reaching" students is the modal response, as it was in 1964. The largest group of teachers, 86.7 percent chose the alternative, "The times I know I have "reached" a student or group of students, and they have learned." In 1964, 86.2 percent of teachers had chosen the same alternative (Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993: 61; Lortie, 1975: 105; Kottkamp, Provenzo and Cohn, 1986).

Lortie links "the primacy of psychic rewards" and "joys of teaching" to the work motivation of teachers. For him, it is great importance to teachers to feel that they have reached their students. This perception is important because the core rewards of teachers are tied to it and their work motivation. He thinks that

> we would therefore expect that much of a teacher's work motivation will rotate around the conduct of daily tasks the actual instruction of students. In that regard, the exertion of effort and the earning of important rewards are congruent (Lortie, 1975: 106).

Johnson's perspective on the linkage of teacher rewards and motivation is close to Lortie's. She argues that low teaching salaries troubled teachers; extra jobs diverted them from the teaching they loved. Teachers' salary, status, and self-respect entwine to produce a demoralizing effect. For Johnson, salaries

> in no instance (...) serve as incentives for respondents to remain in teaching, to work harder, or to focus their efforts on particular goals. The motivation for good teaching came from other sources, primarily from their students and the work itself (Johnson, 1990: 311-312).

Lieberman and Miller (1984: 11) state almost the same perspective as Lortie and Johnson on the linkage between teacher rewards and motivation. According to them, rewards which come from teacher-student interactions motivate teachers. For them, "almost all rewards come from students," and teachers' relationships with them are of primary importance. They state that

> we cannot overstate the importance of teacher-student interactions. When the rewards from these interactions are plentiful, teachers are energized and thrive. When the rewards from these interactions are diminished, teachers lose that part of themselves that is most self-sustaining and most central to the well-being of the profession (Lieberman and Miller, 1984: 11).

Teachers' psychological satisfaction or intrinsic rewards are subjective valuations. It is related to work itself, to the interaction of teachers and students or teachers and work itself. The literature review shows that teachers' responses regarding psychological rewards mostly revolve around classroom events. For example, teachers' satisfaction accompanies desirable results with students. Teachers experienced gratification when they felt that they had influenced students. In the research conducted through interviews, they frequently talked about classroom and student events. It seems that teachers consider the classroom the major arena to earn psychological rewards. The concern with classroom results dominates their responses; teaching is satisfying and encouraging when positive things happen in the classroom (Lortie, 1975: 104; Johnson, 1990).

The literature reveals that teachers rank the importance of intrinsic rewards at the highest level (see Table 1). They relate their psychological satisfaction to students and their learning (see Table 7) and indicate that "reaching student" or

knowing that students have learned is their most important satisfaction source (Lortie, 1975; Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993). In both interviews and surveys conducted at different times the results are almost the same: intrinsic rewards are important to teachers (Johnson, 1990; NEA, 1992). Although intrinsic rewards are important to teachers, it seems that the role of intrinsic rewards as a variable in teacher motivation should be further discussed.

The scholars who study teachers' intrinsic rewards emphasize the importance of these rewards to teachers even more than teachers themselves. In the studies of Lieberman and Miller (1984), Johnson (1990), Lortie (1975), and the NEA (1963-1992), great emphasis is placed on the intrinsic rewards coming from classroom events and interactions. Relationship between teachers and students and the rewards coming from their interaction are important and there is nothing wrong with the scholars' emphasis on the intrinsic rewards. However, they also establish a means-ends relationship between this interaction and teacher motivation. The implications of their perspective make the quality of teacher motivation subject to the quality of student-teacher interaction. Since the quality of teacher-student interaction is only one of the factors influencing teacher motivation, the argument which considers the intrinsic rewards derived from the teacher-student interaction as the main determinant of teacher motivation should be further discussed.

In the context of this discussion, the important questions are why the students, classroom, and especially the events taking place in the classroom and with the students are so important to teachers, and what is the nature of the relationship between these events and teacher motivation. Lortie (1975; 1969), Johnson (1990; 1986), Lieberman and Miller (1984), NEA (1963; 1972), Jackson (1968), and Jackson and Belford (1965) respond to these questions in a similar way. They argue that the classroom, students, and teaching itself are the sources of intrinsic rewards. Teachers earn intrinsic rewards through their teaching in the classroom, and "reaching" students. This is the "joy of teaching." Teachers like "the joy," they want more and more joy, and this desire motivates them to teach better.

The argument describing teaching as a source of psychological rewards and teachers as intrinsic reward oriented "entrepreneurs" does not reflect the whole picture. For teachers, teaching is their occupation, that is, it is the source of resources necessary for their survival and self-realization. Teachers do not teach only for the "joy of teaching," for the sake of psychological rewards. If it were the case, then there would be no reason to be concerned about teachers' economic income, prestige, and decision making power. There would also be no rationale for teacher strikes or struggles for salary increases.

As indicated, there is a linkage between the efforts of teachers and the amount of psychological rewards they receive. More effort in the classroom and with students produces more psychological rewards and the majority of teachers prefer psychological rewards to other rewards (see Table 1). If this is the case, that is, if teachers really are intrinsic reward-oriented entrepreneurs, and if they are able to maximize their intrinsic rewards, then all teachers are expected to perform well. If this is the case then teachers should work harder to teach better in order to earn more psychological rewards; it would be a self-sustaining circle improving constantly teacher motivation and performance. Obviously, this is not the case. There is no teacher who teaches only for the sake of the "joys of teaching."

Teaching as an occupation is the source of a multiplicity of rewards for teachers. Their success with students is linked to their extrinsic rewards as well as psychological ones. For example, their achievement in the classroom is one of the important components determining their opportunities in the teacher market. Classroom achievement also determines the amount of joy they will receive from teaching. Psychological rewards are subjective valuations which teachers can feel by themselves. However, because of the related structural conditions or the reward system in teaching, teachers are not able to convert their achievement with students to extrinsic rewards. It can be argued that except for some facilitators of classroom performance, there is no obstacle before teachers to improve their psychological rewards. In a sense, they are free to teach better and to improve their psychological rewards; but they do not do this. Psychological rewards are not enough to meet the expectations of teachers, and to motivate them. Of course, for teachers, the meaning of teaching as an occupation is more than earning their living. It seems that they elaborate its meaning with a rhetoric of non-material rewards which is consistent with prevailing social values and expectations.

The meaning of work is more than achieving the given goal. All laborers, as well as teachers, make more of their daily routines, investing them with special feeling and meanings (Lortie, 1975: 107). The meaning of teaching for teachers is more than economic rewards, prestige, and power. They want to produce a value, service or commodity which would make sense and which has a meaning. Knowing and feeling that they are doing something meaningful gives them pleasure and psychological satisfaction; it is the joy of teaching. It can be safely stated that intrinsic rewards are important to teachers and the opportunities to earn intrinsic rewards motivate them. **It is proposed that the greater the opportunities to earn intrinsic rewards, the greater will be teacher motivation.**

Means Rewards and Motivation

In this section, a new reward category, "means reward" which consists of components necessary for the realization and betterment of teaching will be explained. Research shows that teachers are concerned about various components relevant to their teaching. Johnson (1990: 322-23) in her research determined a set of components which matter to teachers. Her classification of these components can be summarized as follows: (1) Physical components: the physical conditions of teacher workplace, whether it is safe, functional, comfortable, and well maintained. Teachers were also concerned about the sufficiency and appropriateness of materials and supplies available. (2) Organizational structure: the number of students and classes assigned to them; the flexibility of school schedule; the amount of discretion they are expected or allowed to exercise in their teaching. (3) Sociological perspectives: the attitudes their students bring to school; the relationship of their school with families they serve; their role as teacher within school and society; and the quality of relationship among colleagues which, for Johnson, "contribute to their sense of belonging, efficacy, and status." (4) Economic factor: teachers "access to the incentives and rewards that matter most to them." For many teachers, Johnson says, job security and pay determine "whether they can concentrate on their teaching or even afford to teach at all." (5) Political considerations: teachers consider whether they can influence decisions about school policy on the issues such as, how money is spent, which textbooks are bought, which teachers will be hired. (6) Cultural features: teachers wonder whether they are supported by the culture of their school where they work. Schools may have constructive norms, rich histories and traditions that can keep the school population as a social group sharing common values, purposes and concerns. (7) Psychological characteristics: teacher apprise psychological characteristics of their workplace; whether "the meaning of teaching in enhanced or diminished" by their schools; whether the stresses of teaching are tolerable or not; and whether their job provides sufficient opportunity for growth.

Johnson (1983) in a different study deals with the same issue under the rubric of "Teachers' Concerns." In this research she interviewed 189 teachers and asked them about "what they needed and wanted" in their work. Through these interviews Johnson found "eleven concerns emerged repeatedly." Without ordering them in terms of rank of importance, these concerns and wants can be summarized as follows: (1) Salaries: teachers seek salaries that would enable them to live comfortably. (2) Job security: they believe it is due them in exchange for accepting positions of public service. (3) Class size: they want to be assigned a reasonable number of students. (4) Teaching load: they want a reasonable number of classes. (5) No non-

teaching duty: teachers want to reduce or eliminate non-teaching duties which they regard as a misuse of their professional time. (6) Non-teaching time: teachers want uninterrupted non-teaching time during which they could relax or catch up on work. (7) Equitable Treatment: they want equitable treatment and resent favoritism. (8) Assurances: they seek assurances that decisions such as transfers and assignments would be made fairly. (9) Power: teachers expect "to have a modest amount of influence over school policies and practices, particularly those affecting their classroom." (10) Recognition and participation: they want "to be consulted and want the opportunity to initiate change," but do not seek "large-scale responsibility for school site-matters." (11) Classroom: teachers' "attention is centered on their classroom."

On the same issue which revolves around teaching and teachers' expectations and concerns, there is relevant data in some other research. In Lortie's study, teachers were asked (1) what changes would help them to be more "effective" in their teaching (see Table 8) and (2) what changes would augment their "satisfaction" with teaching (see Table 9) The results show that teachers listed different sets of components to improve their effectiveness in teaching and their satisfaction with teaching.

As seen in Table 8 and Table 9 there is a multiplicity of components which matter to teachers. It appears that teachers want to increase the amount and the quality of some components, but to get rid of some other components to improve their effectiveness and satisfaction. Teachers also relate some components to both effectiveness and satisfaction, that is, there are some overlapping preferences which indicate the importance of these components to teachers.

Also there are significant differences between the two lists. For example, as seen in Table 9, in the satisfaction list, "money and promotion" is the most mentioned component, however in Table 8, in the effectiveness list "money and promotion" is not mentioned at all, but "better facilities" is at the top.

As seen in the Table 8 and Table 9, teachers do not link money and effectiveness. Lortie (1975: 183) comments on this result by saying that this situation "raises a question about the allegations of union and teacher association leaders that more monetary rewards will yield greater productivity." At first glance, this interpretation seems correct, teachers do not link money and effectiveness. However, this does not mean that there is no link between money and effectiveness. Teachers link money to their satisfaction at the highest level and since unsatisfied teachers can be hardly productive, there is a linkage between satisfaction and productivity.

A close look at the means identified in the research, which are basic components of teaching and are important to teachers, can be helpful in re-categorizing teacher rewards. Among the components, one set is teachers' extrinsic rewards, such as money, promotion, decision making power, recognition and reputation. These are the extrinsic rewards teachers want to increase for their effectiveness and satisfaction. Another set of components constitutes intrinsic rewards, such as reaching students, helping others, and feeling the joy of teaching. In the context of teaching the rewards in these two categories are the end-rewards.

A third category of components identified in the research is also important to teachers, but they are not end-rewards in teaching. In other words, teachers do not enter teaching or do not stay in teaching for the sake of these components, but they are important to teachers to perform their job. This phenomenon provides sufficient support to establish a new category of teacher rewards. Some of these components are classroom facilities, class size, better students, more teaching time, better parents, and teaching materials. These components do not reflect or represent extrinsic or intrinsic rewards by themselves. Outside the context of teaching, they do not mean anything to teachers. However, in the context of teaching they matter most to teachers, because they are the means utilized by teachers to earn both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. The amount and quality of these components are important determinants of teacher rewards.

As research shows, the classroom, students, and the conduct of teaching itself are important to teachers. Teachers care about the quality of classroom facilities, the quality of students, the class size, and many other components possessing potential for the betterment of teaching. These are not direct, or end rewards teachers expect from teaching, but the necessary means to earn the end rewards in teaching.

Since the "means rewards" is formulated for the first time in this study, there are no empirical data to compare its importance with other teacher rewards. However, the testimony of teachers (Johnson, 1990; 1983) provides sufficient support to state that means rewards such as better students, small classes, quality facilities and teaching materials are important to teachers and the opportunities to earn them motivate teachers. It is proposed that the greater the opportunities to earn means rewards, the greater will be teacher motivation.

Teacher Ideas and Motivation

In this study it is assumed that there are two categories of components behind human behaviors and teacher performance as well. The first category consists of "interests" and as explained in the previous section, it includes every kinds of

resources and rewards necessary for human survival and self- realization (Weber, 1978; 1958; Pellion, 1993; Ozcan, 1993). The second category consists of "ideas" which contains knowledge, rules, and norms and can be classified as "beliefs" and "values" (Myrdal, 1962/1944; Westie, 1995). In this study the terms "ideas" represents teachers' beliefs and values relevant to teaching.

The review of literature reveals that opportunities to earn rewards matter to teachers and motivate them. However, opportunities to create an action-impulse, a motivating force are necessary, but not sufficient for social action; ideas are also required to define the situation (Weber, 1978; Parsons, 1938; Bendix, 1946; 1977). The initial action-impulse to act is considered in light of the ideas of individuals which stand for individuals' societal and professional cultures and perception of a multiplicity of environmental conditions. In the case of teacher motivation, reward-opportunities offered to teachers are not enough to create a motivated action; teachers' ideas is also a defining component in this process. In the following section, the sources of teacher ideas, beliefs and values, will be discussed.

Teachers' Beliefs and Culture of Teaching

Teachers' beliefs on teaching is a significant variable in determining their performance and the culture of teaching is a main source of their beliefs. In specific contexts, the term culture takes on specific meanings. Occupational culture is an aggregate of occupation-specific knowledge, rules, values, methods, and practices. As an accumulation of historical experience, the culture of a given occupation is a significant factor in determining the conduct of its practitioners. An occupational community can be considered as a status group with a subgroup culture (Weber, 1978). The strength of association among group members may vary in different occupations. Dreeben, in the Nature of Teaching (1970: 13) indicates common ways through which the members of occupations associate with each other. Plurality of common values and norms is an indicator of the strength of occupational culture.

Waller, in his Sociology of Teaching (1965/932) inquires what teaching does to teachers. For him, "teaching makes the teacher (...). Teaching does something to those who teach." Teachers know of changes that have taken place in themselves, and in fact "the relentless march of growing teacherishness in others" is observable, people can recognize it (Waller, 1965/1932: 375-376). Waller states that the question of what teaching does to teachers is only a part of a greater issue. In this context the overarching issue is what any occupation does to its practitioners. Waller argues that the differences that go with the locale are fading, "it is the occupation that most

marks the man." He considers teaching an occupation and states that "teaching is by no means the only occupation which whittles its followers to convenient size and seasons them to suit its taste" (Waller, 1965/1932: 375).

One common characteristic of scholars studying teachers and teaching is that almost all of them acknowledge the existence of a teacher culture. Although these scholars have differences concerning the degree of strength of this culture or of the ways to label and analyze it, the culture of teaching is a common category in their work. Some use the term "teacher culture," some prefer "culture of teaching," some others use the terms such as "primary culture," or "secondary culture." There are also some scholars who do not use the term culture, but define the concept and relate it to teachers and their occupation (Waller, 1965/1932: 375-76, 389; Lortie, 1975: 192; Sarason, 1982: 3, 32; Alexander, 1984: 156; Johnson, 1989: 217-221; Lieberman and Miller, 1984: 47-48, 84; Freedman, et al, 1983: 261; Lightfoot, 1983: 245; Dreeben, 1970).

Although there is agreement on the existence of the culture of teaching, there are different views on the power of this culture in shaping teaching as an occupation and in determining teacher's professional conduct. According to Waller, "certainly teaching leaves no plainer mark than some other vocations." As mentioned, for him "teaching makes the teacher" (Waller, 1965/1932: 375-76). However, according to Lortie (1975: 207-208; 1969), and Lieberman and Miller (1984: 4, 47-49) Waller's argument does not hold true everytime or in all contexts. For Lortie, recruitment, socialization, and reward patterns in teaching keep the occupation going. These processes "foster particular outlooks among teachers, specifically the orientations of conservatism, individualism, and presentism" (Lortie, 1975: 208). Instead of using the term culture, Lortie (1975: 212) uses the term "ethos," and claims that in the ethos of the American classroom teacher "conservatism," "individualism," and "presentism" are significant components. According to Lortie's judgment, teacher culture is not powerful enough to shape teacher conduct. For him, although teachers have an ethos, not every aspect of their culture is common among teachers. For example, Lortie (1975: 192, 193) argues that because of the nature of teaching, teachers do no work closely, and "do not share a powerful technical culture." However, he accepts that "collegial norms" in teaching "influence newcomers" (Lortie, 1975: 193, 195).

Although Lortie recognizes the existence of a teaching culture, the notion stated in his work is that teaching does not have a refined technical culture, like those of college professors. Therefore, for him, teaching is a semi-profession. He states that occupational cultures like other cultures grow through protracted interactions and communications among members of the group. For Lortie,

> Teaching as an activity involving contact with students, is carried on by individuals whose contacts with one another are essentially at the periphery of the central transactions. Such conditions are neither likely to produce a culture marked by rich, specific, and detailed technical terms and procedures nor calculated to develop norms which operationalize values (Lortie, 1969)

The members of an occupation are expected to internalize the standards of their profession, and the inculcation of these standards requires an elaborated occupational culture. For Lortie, although teachers have a subculture, there are some important ways in which "teaching differs from what is associated with a high degree of professionalization." He further argues that the social status of teaching, the teacher's role, and transmission of its subculture point to "truncated rather than fully realized professionalization." Teaching is only partially professionalized (Lortie, 1975: 67; Gross and Gross, 1985: 211-13).

There are also arguments that the culture of teaching is better developed at the elementary level than at other levels (Alexander, 1984: 156; Freedman, Jackson, and Boles, 1983: 261; Lortie, 1969; Gross and Gross, 1985: 211). For Alexander, teaching culture can be divided, for example, into primary and secondary and the "primary culture" of professional teaching culture is important. Lortie (1969) notes that there is a tradition in elementary teaching which represents a faint replica of the inculcation of technical practice (Lortie, 1969; Gross and Gross, 1985: 211). Freedman and her colleagues, a group of public elementary school teachers studying the "effects of teaching on teachers," express their ideas on this issue as follows:
We believe that the work situation of elementary school teachers intrinsically creates a culture whose aspects are overwhelmingly shared by all the teachers at this level, no matter what their present teaching situation or what background they have brought to teaching (Freedman, Jackson, and Boles, 1985: 261).

In modern society, teachers work in organizations which operate with a set of rules and norms. The rules and values of organizations bring order and meaning to the life of the organizations. In the context of educational organizations, Johnson (1990: 218) refers to this set of rules and values as bonds and classifies them as cultural and rational. Rational bonds are the rules, roles, functions, penalties, and authority that regulate the behavior of individuals in organizations. They unify participants by defining their responsibilities and roles. Cultural or symbolic bonds, on the other hand, include "the shared purposes, values, traditions, and history that promote harmonious behavior and a sense of community" (Johnson, 1990: 218). In contrast to the external characteristics of rational bonds, cultural/symbolic bonds

provide participants with internal links that keep them together. In fact, if the concept of culture is taken as a broader concept including human creations, then every kind of organizational bond explained by Johnson can be understood as organizational culture, and in the context of education it can be called "teaching culture." A public school teacher explain the meaning and importance of the culture of teaching as follows: "We all have something in common. I am not sure what we have in common, because once we leave, we go our separate ways (...). I think we are all just thrown together and then come out being like each other in a way (as reported in Johnson, 1990: 222).

The review of literature relevant to the nature of teachers reveals that teachers have an occupational culture; they perceive themselves as a group (Freedman et al, 1983), and the traditional culture of teaching affects their personalities and occupational conduct (Waller, 1965/1932: 28). For Lightfoot (1983: 245), teachers' personalities are influenced by the special nature of their work. They move back and forth between "familiarity, liking, caring, warmth," and display a "teacher-like stance" (Lieberman and Miller, 1984: 20). Research shows that there is a culture of teaching and it is influential in making teachers' ideas of teaching. It is proposed that the greater the consistency between reward opportunities and teachers' professional culture, beliefs, knowledge and skills, the greater will be teacher motivation.

Teachers' Values and Social Group Cultures

Values are the commonly shared ideas by the members of a social group. Teachers live as the members of various social groups and the values of these groups are influential in their behavior. Individuals hardly act against the values they believe. In this section, three of these groups, social class, ethnicity, and gender will be investigated.

Teachers' Social Class

The literature reveals that throughout American history teachers have come from middle class backgrounds. In the middle class category, the largest group of teachers appears to have come from lower middle class families. Rury (1989: 10) claims that more than any other professional group in the United States, teachers have been identified with "farmers, shopkeepers, artisans, and low-level managers who have occupied the rough edge between manual and intellectual labor." A 1910 study contains information about teachers' social background. As seen in Table 10,

according to the data collected by a questionnaire from 5215 teachers, most teachers were from middle class (Coffmann, 1911: 73, as reported in Rury, 1989: 32).

The observations of Robert Dreeben (1970) on the social background of American teachers are consistent with Rury's (1989) observations. Dreeben indicates that about one-quarter of the teachers come from farm families, another quarter are the children of skilled or semi-skilled workers, and a third quarter come from families with a managerial father. Out of the fourth quarter, 15 percent come from professional families and seven percent are the children of sales or clerical workers. For Dreeben (1970: 159), the teaching profession recruits from the whole range of society, but it recruits more from the center than from the extremes.

According to Vane and Schlechty's (1981) study, the largest proportion of teachers comes from lower and middle economic classes. For example, among college graduates who are recruited to education, 37.3 percent comes from low socio-economic class, 28.7 comes from medium socio-economic class, and 22.5 comes from high socio-economic class (See Table 11). It appears in the literature that teachers come from middle and lower middle classes and constitute a middle class occupational group. It is conventional to connect the term "middle class" with teachers. Although as a category "middle class" is large, it may have particular usefulness in depicting teaching as an occupation. The term middle class "connotes some of teaching's most characteristics features, such as respectability, stability in life style, and income predictability;" it also points up the presumed necessity for continued employment among middle class people (Lortie, 1975: 13).

Teachers' Ethnic Background

Another significant issue in dealing with teachers social characteristics is the teachers' racial and ethnic background. Literature shows that since the beginning of the United States, most teachers have been white. Other ethnic groups, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans and other immigrants have been under-represented in the American teaching population (Rury, 1989: 10). However, African Americans have been relatively better represented among teachers than any other professional group.

As seen in Tables 12, and 13, there is three, at least two constant ethnic group among the American teachers. The proportion of African American population is more than 12 percent of the entire population, but their proportion in the teaching force has been less than this (Rury, 1989: 41). Murnane and his colleagues (1991: 31-32), to answer the question of who will be teachers in the 1990s, look to the data on the characteristics of those who became teachers between the late 1960s and the

early 1980s. According to their observations in the 1990s, fewer African American will enter teaching. For this study the important point is that if there is any difference between teachers who are members of different ethnic groups in terms of the importance of teachers rewards or motivational variables.

In the National Education Association's periodic five year surveys, there is a question in which teachers are asked about the main reasons keeping them in teaching. Teachers are given 21 alternatives and asked to mark three of them. As seen in Table 14, there are some differences among teachers by their ethnic background. For example, 40.9 percent of White teachers chose the alternative, "Value or significance of education in society," as a main reason for which they are teaching. However, 50.6 percent of minority teachers chose the same alternative. There are also differences between White and minority teachers in their preferences of financial rewards,

Teachers identify themselves with the interests and ideas of their status groups and the cultures of these groups as the sources of ideas affects their behaviors. In the previous chapter, the literature relevant to four of these groups was reviewed. Teachers' occupational, social class, ethnic, and gender characteristics were investigated to discover the linkage if any between motivational variables and teachers' status group characteristics. It was seen that teachers' occupational culture is influential in making their ideas of professional conduct. In terms of teachers' social class background, the relevant literature reveals that teachers are middle class and lower-middle class people (Rury, 1989; Dreeben, 1970; Lortie, 1975). However, as a category, "middle class" is too large to derive implications and there are no data differentiating teachers by their class differences.

In terms of their ethnic characteristics, in the current statisitcs, American public school teachers are divided into three groups as White, African, and Hispanics Americans (NEA, 1992; Statistical Abstract, 1992). Although the research is limited on the variations among teachers from different ethnic groups in their preferences of rewards or motivational variables, available data suggest that there are differences between White and minority teachers (see Table 14).

Teachers' Gender

Gender is another significant variable which differentiates teachers. Since the nineteenth century approximately 70 percent of teachers are female versus 30 percent male (see Table 15). According to research, it appears that there are some differences between male and female teachers in their preferences of teacher rewards (see Table 16). The differentiation between female and male teachers in

their ranking of the importance of economic rewards is also observed in some other research (Lortie, 1975; Johnson, 1990). Also literature reveals that male and female teachers are different from each other in their ranking of the value of "time schedule of teaching."

The literature reveals that especially for female teachers the schedule of teaching is an attractive factor, because it facilitates their family life. For married female teachers, "the correspondence of their work schedule and their children's school schedules" makes possible both working and family life (Johnson, 1990: 38). The schedule of schooling gives them an opportunity to combine their teaching life and family life. For teachers who are parents, teaching provides valuable scheduling flexibility to take care of their children. It fits the "motherhood" and "wifehood" roles (Lortie, 1975: 32). The research findings suggest that teachers' social group characteristics affect their behaviors.

There are significant differences between female and male teachers in the importance of motivational variables to them. As seen in Table 16, if teachers are asked about the main reasons keeping them in teaching, some differences appear in the responses of female and male teachers. According to the NEA survey of 1991, 19.5 percent of female teachers chose the alternative, "Need for second income," as a reason keeping them in teaching, however, only 0.6 percent of male teachers chose the same alternative. Also the research conducted through interviews with teachers reveals that there are differences between female and male teachers in terms of their preferences of rewards. For example, male teachers are more interested in administrational positions and frequently complain about the insufficiency of economic rewards. However, time schedule of teaching is frequently mentioned by female teachers as an appealing variable, because it allows them to take care of their family responsibilities (Lortie, 1975; Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn, 1986; Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993; Johnson, 1990)

As results, teachers' social group background is an important determinant of their choices and behaviors. The group values they indentify with are important to them. Research shows that there are differences among teachers who are the members of different social class, gender, and ethnic groups. Social groups norms and values are the sources of their ideas of personal and professional conduct. It is safe to say that if incentives offered to teacher to motivate them are not consistent with their social group values, they can hardly motivate teachers. In order to motivate teachers, incentives or reward-opportunities should be consistent with teachers' values. It is proposed that the greater the consistency between

reward-opportunities and teachers' social group values, the greater will be teacher motivation.

Teacher Evaluation and Motivation

Occupations are set of specific, goal oriented behaviors designed to produce some specific commodities or services. The rationale behind the creation of an occupation is to meet the demand for a specific outcome. In this sense, teaching as an occupation is performed to produce specific outcomes people demand to utilize in their survival and self-realization struggle.

Individuals in their daily life engage in activities for various specified or unspecified reasons. However if they engage in an occupation, the reasons, procedures, and qualities of an expected outcome become clear and determined. Employees engage in occupations at will to perform specific actions and produce specific outcomes for which they expect to be rewarded. This rationale creates a natural linkage between outcome and reward; employees are rewarded or supposed to be rewarded according to the outcome they produce. If they are able to produce the specified and expected outcome, they are rewarded.

Teacher assessment and evaluation can be discussed under two rubrics: (1) Subjective evaluation, and (2) objective evaluation. The traditional method of teacher evaluation is based primarily on classroom observations of a supervisor which takes place once, or at best a few times in a semester or a year. The supervisors observe teachers and make their evaluations of the performance of the teachers. In this way, different supervisors observing the same teachers at the same time can make different evaluations. This is, in a real sense, a subjective method of teacher assessment and evaluation.

Part of the rationale behind teacher incentive programs is that there are differences among teachers in terms of their performance and productivity, and to keep them motivated, teachers should be rewarded according to the quality of their work. Since the differences among teachers cannot be substantiated through subjective evaluation, it is difficult to convince teachers that they are rewarded differently yet fairly. Therefore, teachers who participate in teacher incentive programs, and who are subjectively evaluated, and rewarded relatively less than other teachers, become resentful and begin to resist the program.

Objective assessment of teachers' work means using some standardized instruments and criteria to assess practices and production of teaching. Currently some school districts are using performance assessment instruments to measure and

evaluate teacher performance. Although this method of evaluation appears to be somewhat different from subjective evaluation, it is in fact based on the observations of a supervisor and therefore a version of subjective evaluation. The most radical method of teacher evaluation is the use of student scores on standardized achievement tests as the indicators of teacher performance. In this way the evaluation of teachers is not the result of the subjective perception of a supervisor, but it is based on the data coming from the student outcome itself. However, there are objections to using standardized tests in teacher assessment and evaluation.

Objections to the objective assessment of teachers' work cluster around the arguments that measuring the work or effectiveness of teacher is too difficult and standardized tests results cannot be indicators of teachers' performance. However, there are empirical data which reveal that these are not valid arguments. According to the research findings most of the teachers think that it is possible to know the effectiveness of teachers (see Table 18). Also there is a tendency among teachers to use external indicators to judge their effectiveness. Some of the external indicators mentioned by teachers are objective tests, student evaluation, peer reactions, parent reaction, and observation of administrators (see Table 17). The research conducted through interviews reveals that most of the teachers consider various test results as the indicators of their effectiveness (Lortie, 1975; 138).

Deficiencies in the assessment of employee performance may elicit unpredicted and potentially destructive responses from them. The perspective provided by microeconomics on employee behavior is helpful in understanding the importance of teacher evaluation in teacher incentive programs. Although Murnane and Cohen (1986) elaborate the implications of the perspective of microeconomics and use them to support their argument against merit pay plans, in the context of this study the key point is the deteriorative nature of imperfect evaluation. It seems that instead of trying to monitor and evaluate teachers' classroom performance, teachers should be given professional authority to perform their work however they want, but they should be held responsible for the outcome they produce.

The literature reveals that doubts about one's effectiveness can spoil the pleasures of teaching. The emotional tone in the responses of teachers interviewed "underlines the degree to which problems of work assessment threaten the work achievement and psychic rewards of classroom teachers" (Lortie, 1975: 142, 150).

In any occupation, the outcome of the work, keeping the other variables constant, is the result of employee performance. Therefore, outcome in a given occupation can be an indicator of employee performance and reflect the quality of

the employee's work. In the unique context of teaching, to clarify the "outcome" and "reward" connection, these two components deserve to be discussed in depth.

Since the nature of teaching requires teachers to make decisions as they are teaching, teacher performance cannot be specified and monitored; it is subject to change. It is the production of individual teachers, and it is somewhat unique in each classroom for every teacher. Also, as discussed above, subjective evaluation of teacher performance creates problems, and objective evaluation is not completely possible, at least not under current conditions. For these reasons, rewarding teachers according to their performance means to reward them according to something which is not known yet and which creates problems.

In contrast to a teacher's classroom performance, the outcome in teaching, which can be taken as the indicator of teachers' classroom performance under certain conditions, does have specific qualities. As discussed, education is a joint enterprise and the qualities of educational outcome are determined by the constituencies of education. The specific qualities of the expected outcome from education are presented to teachers as the objectives of teaching. Teachers do not have authority to modify or reject them, but are hired with the expectation of producing the given outcome.

Theoretically, the work of employees is evaluated according to certain criteria, the given features of expected outcome. These criteria are given to teachers as the qualities of outcome or as the objectives of teaching. The work of teachers should be assessed objectively according to these criteria. Although objective assessment of outcomes is difficult in teaching, it must be undertaken in order to evaluate and reward teachers for the quality of their work.

It can be argued that objective teacher assessment will make the work of teachers visible so that teachers can be differentiated and rewarded according to their real work. In other words, according to the objective assessment results of their work, teachers are recognized and rewarded through different ways by students, parents, peers, and administrators; at least their professional authority improves informally. Since rewards are contingent upon each other (Collins, 1975; Weber, 1978), honorific and authoritative rewards can create opportunities to earn other rewards.

It can be stated that the objective assessment of teachers' work is difficult, yet possible. If the work of individual teachers or the work of a group of teachers is objectively assessed, differentiated, and made visible, this situation facilitates them to get rewarded. Since objective assessment and visibility of teachers' work will facilitate them to receive honorific rewards, respect and recognition, and since

rewards are contingent upon each other, the objective assessment of teacher's work will lead to maximization of teacher's rewards and motivate teachers. It is proposed that the greater the objectivity of the feedback coming from assessment of teacher performance, the greater will be teacher motivation.

DISCUSSION

Consistency between incentives or reward opportunities and practitioners' ideas is a significant factor in motivating employees to implement a given reform program. It might be possible in the occupations which use sophisticated evaluation techniques to measure employee's outcome, and do not necessitate employees to make decisions. Teaching is not such an occupation; it has deficiencies in performance evaluation and requires teachers to make decisions. In these types of occupations, as documented in microeconomics, there is a tendency among employees, if it is necessary, to develop behaviors that "makes them appear productive," when in fact they are not (Murnane and Cohen, 1986).

In education, reform programs or any kind of innovation, though mostly designed by political authorities, are implemented by teachers. Educational reform programs usually necessitate extra efforts by teachers and are offered to teachers together with an incentive program. Since incentive programs provide teachers with rewards, teachers are expected to be motivated by these programs and realize the desired reform. However, if the reform program is not approved by teachers, if it is not consistent with teachers' beliefs and values, they should not be expected to commit themselves to realizing the desired reform.

Since teachers do not have the political and financial power to reject or modify the dictated reform programs and the rewards tied to them, they usually have to accept whatever they are presented. Even in the case of a voluntary participation in a reform program, because of the attraction of rewards, teachers, regardless of their professional input, usually participate in the program (Iowa Dep. of Ed., 1989). However, a high ratio of teacher participation in educational reform programs, whether compulsory or volunteer, does not mean that they are motivated to commit themselves to the realization of a given program.

If teachers do not believe in an educational reform program offering incentives yet participate in that program because of the attraction of the reward or the fear of forfeiting rewards (such as losing money or missing promotion), they will find themselves in an inner conflict. It is likely that reform will end in failure like many of those documented in literature. It can be argued that the success of a teacher motivation program is subject not only to the reward-opportunities offered

but to the consistency of reward opportunities and teachers' ideas. This consistency can be created by providing teachers with the opportunities for professional-cultural participation. Teachers should have the opportunity to present their ideas and utilize their professional cultural heritage in their occupational conduct. Professional participation of teachers in educational processes, like their political-administrative participation, reinforces their sense of ownership of teaching.

CONCLUSIONS

In this study, it is assumed that teachers as human beings are naturally motivated to survive, utilize their potential, and realize themselves. To this end, they need material and ideal resources, and engage in teaching as their occupation to earn the necessary resources. Also as humans, teachers are cultural beings with beliefs and values. Possibilities to earn resources necessary to survive and self-realization motivate them to act, however this action-impulse is evaluated in light of teachers' ideas and the fate of the bahavior is determined. Therefore the most important two components behind human behaviors and teacher performance as well are "interests" and "ideas." "Interests" include every kinds of resources and rewards necessary for human survival and self- realization (Weber, 1978; 1958; Pellion, 1993; Ozcan, 1993). "Ideas" contains knowledge, rules, and norms and can be classified as "beliefs" and "values" (Myrdal, 1962/1944; Westie, 1995).

In the literature, teacher rewards are usually categorized as extrinsic, intrinsic, and ancillary rewards (Lortie, 1975; Johnson, 1986;1990; Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993). In this study, the category of ancillary rewards was excluded and a new reward category, "means rewards," was formulated. Ancillary rewards are "built-in" rewards in teaching. They can motivate people to enter teaching, but the opportunities to earn them do not motivate teachers, they are already earned. "Means rewards" are not by themselves end-rewards usable to meet teachers' survival and self-realization needs. All kinds of rewards teaching offers were categorized into three groups as extrinsic, intrinsic, and means rewards, and extrinsic rewards were further divided into economic, honorific, and political rewards.

It was found that there is a tendency among teachers to overlook the importance of economic rewards and to over-emphasize the importance of intrinsic rewards. The reasons behind this tendency were discussed and it was concluded that some social and normative values are influential in determining teachers' attitudes toward economic and psychological rewards.

Teachers' ideas which can be classified as beliefs and values are also important determinant of teacher performance. Teachers' beliefs and values relevant to teaching come from (1) the occupational culture of teachers, (2) the feedback based on the assessment and evaluation of teacher performance, and (3) the cultures of social groups with which teachers identify themselves. It is observed that differences in the sources of ideas are creating differences in the valuations of rewards among teachers (National Education Association, 1967; 1972; 1977; 1982; 1987; 1992; Lortie, 1975; Cohn and Kottkamp, 1993).

The propositions of the proposed theory of teacher motivation are summarized as follows:

1. The greater the opportunities to earn economic rewards, the greater will be teacher motivation.

2. The greater the opportunities to earn honorific rewards, the greater will be teacher motivation.

3. The greater the opportunities to earn political rewards -decision making power and a sense of ownership of teaching,- the greater will be teacher motivation.

4. The greater the opportunities to earn intrinsic rewards the greater will be teacher motivation.

5. The greater the opportunities to earn means rewards-necessary vehicles to earn intrinsic and extrinsic rewards-, the greater will be teacher motivation.

6. The greater the consistency between reward-opportunities and teachers' beliefs of teaching, the greater will be teacher motivation.

7. The greater the consistency between reward-opportunities and teachers' social group values, the greater will be teacher motivation.

8. The greater the objectivity of the feedback coming from the assessment and evaluation of teachers' performance, the greater will be teacher motivation.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. 1965. "Injustice in Social Exchange," in L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advance in Experimental Social Psychology. v2, New York: Academic Press, pp267-299.

Adams, J. S. 1975. "Inequality in Social Exchange," in R. M. Steers and L. W. Porter (Eds.), Motivation and Work Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. 1985. Theoretical Logic in Sociology - The Classical Attempt at Theoretical Synthesis: Max Weber, v3. Berkeley: The University of California Press.

American College Testing (ACT). Official Guide to the ACT Assessment. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education. 1985. Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Washington, DC: APA.

Argyris, C. 1957. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper

Babbie, Earl. 1989. The Practice of Social Research, fifth ed.. California: Wadsworth Pub. Comp.

Bartell, Carol A. 1987. Incentives That Enhance the Teaching Profession: Background Paper. Illinois: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Beck, Robert C. 1983. Motivation. Second edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc..

Bell, Terrel. 1983. Toward Reform and Revitalization of the Teaching Profession. Washington, D.C: US Department of Education.

Bell, Terrel. 1984. "Leadership for Reform and Renewal of American Education", American Education, v20, n2, pp5-9.

Bell, Terrel. 1986. "Education Policy Development in the Reagan Administration", Phi Delta Kappan, v67, n7, pp487-493.

Bell, Terrel. 1988. The Thirteenth Man, A Reagan Cabinet Memoir, New York: The Free Press.

Bendix, Reinhard. 1977. Max Weber - An Intellectual Portrait. Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Bendix, Reinhard. 1946. "Max Weber's Interpretation of Conduct and History," The American Journal of Sociology, May, vLI, n6, pp518-526.

Borg, Walter R. and Meredith D. Gall. 1989. Educational Research. New York: Longman.

Boyer, Ernest. 1983. High School : A Report on Secondary Education in America, Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brandt, Richard M. 1990. Incentive Pay and Career Ladders For Today's Teachers. New York: State University of New York Press.

Brody, Nathan. 1980. "Social Motivation," in M. R. Rosenzweig and L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology. California: Annual Review.

Bullivant, Brian M. 1993. "Culture: Its Nature and Meaning for Educators," in James Banks, and Cherry A. M. Banks (Eds.), Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives. Second ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon, pp29-47.

Callahan, Raymond E. 1964. Education and the Cult of Efficacy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Carlson, Richard O.. 1961. "Variation and Myth in the Social Status of Teachers," Journal of Educational Sociology, 35, November, pp104-118.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. 1986. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.

Clark, David L., Terry A. Astuto, and Paula M. Rooney. 1983. "The Changing Structure of Federal Education Policy in the 1980s," Phi Delta Kappan, v65, n3, pp188-194.

Coffman, Lotus Delta. 1911. The Social Composition of the Teaching Population. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cohen, Bernard P. 1989. Developing Sociological Knowledge: Theory and Method. Second ed., Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Cohen, David K. and Richard J. Murnane. 1985. "The Merits of Merit Pay." The Public Interests, n80, pp3-29.

Cohn, Marilyn and Rober Kottkamp. 1993. Teachers: The Missing Voice in Education. New York: State University of New York Press.

Coleman, James. 1990. Foundations of Social Theory. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Collins, Randall. 1971. "Functional and Conflict Theories of Educational Stratification." American Sociological Review, v36, n6.

Collins, Randall. 1975. Conflict Sociology, New York: Academic Press.

Collins, Randall. 1977. "Some Comparative Principles of Educational Stratification," Harvard Educational Review, v47, n1.

Collins, Randall. 1985. Three Sociological Traditions. New York: Academic Press.

Collins, Randall. 1986a. "Interaction Ritual Chains, Power, and Property," in J. Alexander, R. Munch, N. J. Smelser, and B. Giessen (Eds), The Micro-Macro Link. Berkeley, California.

Collins, Randall. 1986b. Weberian Sociological Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coombs, Philip H. 1985. The World Crisis in Education. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Cusick, Philip. 1983. The American High School and the Egalitarian Ideal. New York: Longman.

Dreeben, Robert. 1970. The Nature of Teaching. Glenview, Ill: Scott Foresman.

Durkheim, Emile. 1933. The Division of Labor in Society. New York: The Free Press.

Elsbree, W. S. 1939. The American Teacher. New York: American Book Comp..

Festinger, L. 1957. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Stanford, CA: California Univ. Press.

Firestone, William and Beth Bader. 1992. Redesigning Teaching: Professionalism or Bureaucracy. New York: State Univ. of New York.

Frase, L. (Ed.). (1992). Teacher Compensation and Motivation. PA: Technomic Pub.

Freedman, Sara, Jane Jackson, and Karherine Boles (Boston Women's Teachers' Group). 1983. "Teaching: An Imperilled 'Profession'," in Lee S. Shulman and Gay Sykes, Handbook of Teaching and Policy. 1983. New York: Leyman Inc..

Freiberg, H. J. December 1984/January 1985. "Master Teacher Programs: Lesson From the Past." Educational Leadership.

Freud, Sigmund. 1959/1908. The Collected Papers of Sigmund Freud. Ed. by E. Jones, v2, New York: Basic Books.

Gallup, George H. 1983. "The 15th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitude Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, v65, p15.

Gidden, Anthony. 1984. The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Stratification. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goodlad, John I. 1984. A Place Called School : Prospects for the Future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gross, Beatrice and Ronald Gross (Eds). 1985. The Great School Debate. New York: Toucstone Book.

Hackman, J. R. and G. R. Oldham. 1980. Work Redesign. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hechter, Michael, D. Friedman, and M. Appelbaum. 1991/1982. "A Theory of Ethnic Collective Action," in Peter Abell (Ed.), Rational Choice Theory, Vermont. pp381-403.

Heckhausen, Heinz. 1991. Motivation and Action. Translated by Peter K. Lappman. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Herzberg, Frederick. 1962. Work and the Nature of Man. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Comp.

Herzberg, Frederick. 1990/1968. "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" Harvard Business Review, November, 4.

Hess, E. H. 1962. "Ethology: An Approach toward the Complete Analysis of Behavior," in R. Brown and et al (Eds), New Directions in Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Holmes Group. 1986. Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, MI.: The Holmes Group Inc..

Homans, G. C. 1961. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt Brace and World.

Howe II, Harold. 1984. "Symposium on the Year of the Reports: Responses From the Educational Community." Harvard Education Review, v54, n1, pp1-28.

Hoyenga, Katharine B. and Kermit T. Hoyenga. 1984. Motivational Explanations of Behavior. California: Brooks/Cole Pub. Comp.

Hughes, E. C. 1985. Men and Their Work. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Hughes, M. 1959. Development of the Mean for the Assessment of the Quality of Teaching in Elementary Schools. Salt Lake City: Univ. of Utah Press.

Hull, C. L. 1943. Principles of Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Iowa Department of Education. 1984. First in the Nation in Education. Des Moines: Department of Education

Iverson, Roderick Dale. 1992. Employee Intent to Stay: An Empirical Test of a Revision of the Price and Mueller Model. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation. The University of Iowa, Sociology Department.

Jackson, Philip W. and E. Belford. 1965. "Educational Objectives and the Joys of Teaching," School Review, v73, pp267-91.

Jackson, Philip W. 1968. Life in Classrooms. New York: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, Susan Moore. 1983. "Teacher Unions in Schools: Authority and Accommodations," Harvard Educational Review, v53, n3, August, pp309-326.

Johnson, Susan Moore. 1984a. "Merit Pay For Teachers: A Poor Prescription for Reform." Harvard Educational Review, v54, n2, pp175-185.

Johnson, Susan Moore. 1984b. Pros and Cons of Merit Pay. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Johnson, Susan Moore. 1986. "Incentives for Teachers: What Motivates, What Matters". Educational Administration Quarterly, v22, n3, p54-79.

Johnson, Susan Moore. 1990. Teachers At Work. Basic Books.

Kalberg, Stephen. 1983. "Max Weber's Universal-Historical Architectonic of Economically-Oriented Action: A Preliminary Reconstruction." Current Perspectives in Social Theory, v4, pp253-288.

Kalberg, S. (1994). Max Weber's comparative historical sociology. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kalberg, Stephen. 1985. "The Role of Ideal Interests in Max Weber's Comparative Historical Sociology," in Rober Antonio and Ronald Glassman (ed), A Weber-Marx Dialogue. Kansas: University of Kansas Press, pp46-67.

Kalberg, Stephen. 1990. "The Rationalization of Action in Max Weber's Sociology of Religion." Sociological Theory, v8, n1, pp58-84.

King, Ronald. 1980. "Weberian Perspectives and the Study of Education", British Journal of Sociology of Education, v1, n1, pp7-23.

Kottkamp, Robert, B., Eugene Provenzo, and Marilyn Cohn. 1986. "Stability and Change in a Profession: Two Decades of Teacher Attitudes, 1964-1984," Phi Delta Kappan, April, v67, n8, pp559-567.

Kocer, Hasan Ali. 1987. Turkiye'de Modern Egitimin Dogusu Ve Gelismesi. 2nd ed.. Ankara.

Lawler III, Edward. 1973. Motivations in Work Organizations. California: Brooks/Cole Pup..

Lawler, Edward E. III. 1983. Pay and Organization Development. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.

Lieberman, Ann and Lynne Miller. 1984. Teachers, Their World, and Their Work. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum.

Lightfoot Sara Lawrence. 1983. The Good High School: Portraits of Character and Culture. New York: Basic Books.

Locke, E. A. 1968. "Toward a Theory of Task and Incentives," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 3, pp157-189.

Lortie, Dan. 1969. "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching," in Semi-Professions and Their Organizations, ed. by Amitai Etzioni. New York: Free Press.

Lortie, Dan. 1975. School Teacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lowry, Richard J (Ed.). 1973. Dominance, Self-Esteem, Self-Actualization: Germinal Papers of A. H. Maslow. Monterey CA: Brooks/Cole Pub. Comp..

Mansbridge, Jane J. (Ed.) 1990. Beyond Self-Interests. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Marx, Karl. 1989. A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. New York: International Publishers.

Maslow, A. H. 1970. Motivation and Personality. Second ed., New York: Harper and Row.

Maslow, A. H. 1973/1943. "A Theory of Human Motivation." Psychological Review, v50, 1943, pp370-396, in Richard Lowry (Ed.), Dominance, Self-Esteem, Self-Actualization: Germinal Papers of A. H. Maslow. 1973, pp153-173.

Mason, W. S. 1961. The Beginning Teacher. Washington D. C. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

McCall, George J. and J. L. Simmons. 1982. Social Psychology: A Sociological Approach. New York: The Free Press.

McClelland, David C. 1985. Human Motivation. Glenview, Ill: Scott, Foresman and Company.

McClelland, David C. and J. W. Atkinson, R. A. Clark, and E. L. Lowell. 1953. The Achievement Motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

McGuire, Carson and George D. White. 1957. "The Social Origins of Teachers in Texas," in Lindley J. Stiles. The Teacher's Role in American Society. New York: Harper and Bros., 1957, pp23-41.

Mead, George H. 1982/1934. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Murnane, Richard J. and David K. Cohen. 1986. "Merit Pay and the Evaluation Problem: Why Most Merit Pay Plans Fail and a Few Survive." Harvard Educational Review, v56, n1, pp1-17.

Murnane, Richard J., Judith D. Singer, John B. Willett, James J. Kemple, and Randall J. Olsen. 1991. Who Will Teach? Policies That Matter. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press

Myrdal, G. (1962/1944). An American dilemma: The Negro problem and modern democracy. New York: Harper and Row.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. 1983. A Nation At Risk : The Imperative for Educational Reform, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Education.

National Education Association (NEA). 1967. The American Public School Teacher, 1965-1966. Washington D. C. : NEA Research Division.

National Education Association. 1972. Status of the American Public School Teacher, 1970-71. Washington, D. C.: NEA Research Division.

National Education Association. 1977. Status of the American Public School Teacher, 1975-1976. Washington, D. C.: NEA Research Division.

National Education Association. 1982. Status of the American Public School Teacher, 1980-1981. Washington, D. C.: NEA Research Division.

National Education Association. 1992. Status of the American Public School Teacher, 1990-1991. Washington, D. C.: NEA Research Division.

National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science, and Technology. 1983. Educating Americans for the 21st Century. 2 vols. Washington, D. C. : National Science Foundation.

Olds, M. E. and J. L. Fobes. 1981. "The Central Basis of Motivation: Int. Self-Stimulation Studies," Annual Review of Psychology. pp523-574.

Ornstein, Norman J. 1981. President and Congress, Assessing Reagan's First Year, Washington: American Enterprise Institute.

Parsons, Talcott. 1968/1937. The Structure of Social Action. v2, New York: The free Press.

Parsons, Talcott. 1938. "The Role of Ideas in Social Action," American Sociological Review, v3, n5, October, pp652-664.

Peillon, Michael. 1990. The Concept of Interest in Social Theory. Lewiston, New York: The Edswin Mellen Press.

Peltzman, Sam. 1984. "Constituent Interest and Congressional Voting", The Journal of Law and Economics, v27, n1, pp181-200.

Pietrasik, Richard. 1987. "Teachers, Action, 1984-86," in Martin Law and Gerald Grace. Teachers: The Culture and Politics of Work, New York: The Falmer Press.

Reagan, Ronald. 1982. "Address to the Nation on the Program for Economic Recovery (Sep. 24, 1981)." Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States 1981. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Reagan, Ronald. 1983. "Speech at Seton Hall University." South Orange, New Jersey.

Reagan, Ronald. 1984. "Remarks on Receiving the Final Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (April 12, 1983)." Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States 1983, Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Rist, M. C. 1983. "Our Nationwide Poll: Most Teachers Endorse Merit Pay Concept." The American School Board Journal, v170, n9, pp23-27.

Ross, E. W., Jeffrey W. C ornett, and Gail McCutcheon (Eds). 1992. Teacher: Personal Theorizing. New York: State University of New York Press.

Runciman, W. G. (Ed). 1988. Weber: Selections in Translation, translated by Eric Matthews. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rury, John L. 1989. "Who Became Teachers? The Social Characteristics of Teachers," in Donald Warren (Ed.), American Teachers: Histories of a Profession at Work, New York: Macmillan pub. comp.

Sarason, Saymour. 1982/1971. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Second ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc..

Schutz, Alfred. 1967/1932. The Phenomenology of the Social World. Evanston, Ill: Nortwestern Univ. Press.

Seligman, M. E. 1975. Helplessness: On Depression, Development, and Death. San Francisco: W. H. Freman.

Sergiovanni, T. J. and F. D. Carver. 1973. The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co..

Skinner, B. F. 1953. Science and Human Behavior. New York: Macmillan.

Spring, Joel. 1986. The American School: 1642-1985. New York: Longman.

Spring, Joel. 1988. Conflict of Interests, the Politics of American Education, New York: Longman.

Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1992. U. S. Census Office.

Sylvia, Ronald D. and Tony Hutchison. 1985. "What Makes Ms. Johnson Teach? A Study of Teacher Motivation." Human Relations, v38, n9, pp841-856.

Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. 1983. Action for Excellence : A Comprehensive Plan to Improve our Nation's Schools, Denver : Education Commission of the States.

Tural, Sadik. 1989. Kulturel Kimlik Uzerine Dusunceler. Ankara: Kultur ve Turizm Bakanligi Yayini.

Turner, Jonathan H. 1988. A Theory of Social Interaction. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Turner, Jonathan. 1986. The Structure of Sociological Theory. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Turner, Jonathan. 1987. "Toward A Sociological Theory of Motivation," American Sociological Review, v58, Feb., pp15-27.

Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy. 1983. Making the Grade. New York: Twentieth Century Fund.

Tyack, David. 1974. The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Urban, Wayne J. 1985. "Old Wine, New Bottles? Merit Pay and Organized Teachers," in Henry C. Johnson, Jr. (Ed.), Merit, Money and Teachers' Careers, New York: University Press of America.

Vance, Victor S. and Philip C. Schlechty. [1981]. The Structure of the Teaching Occupation and the Characteristics of Teachers: A Sociological Study. A report for the National Institute of Education.

Vroom, Victor. 1964. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley.

Waller, Willard. 1965/1932. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc..

Wattengerg , William et al. 1957. "Social Origins of Teachers: A Northern Industrial City," Science Education.

Weber, Max. 1958. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, translated and edited by H. H. Gerth and Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, Max. 1976. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism., translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Weber, Max. 1978. Economy and Society. Ed. by G. Roth and C. Wittch. Berkeley: University of California Press, v1 and 2.

Weick, K. E. 1966. "Equity and the Perception of Pay." Administrative Science Quarterly, v11, n3, pp413-439.

Westie, F. R. (1995). Race stratification and the culture of legitimation. In John H. Stanfield (Ed.). A History of Race Relations Research. Newbury Park: Sage, (255-282).

Westie, F. R. (1965, August). The American Dilemma: An empirical Test. American Sociological Review, 30(4), 527-538.

Young, L. P. 1933. The Administration of Merit-Type Teachers' Salary Schedule, New York: Columbia University Press.

TABLES

Table 1. The Importance of Reward Categories to Teachers

Of the features grouped below, I think that the following is most important to me.	1964 Lortie	1984 Kottkamp Provenzo Cohn McCloskey
	%	%
The salary and respect received and the position of influence	11.9	11.3
The opportunities to study, plan, master classroom management, "reach" students and associate with colleagues and children	76.3	70.2
The economic security, time, freedom from competition and appropriateness for persons like me	11.8	18.4

Source: Adapted from Dan Lortie, Schoolteacher. 1975: 105; Marilyn Cohn and Robert Kottkamp, Teachers: The Missing Voice in Education. 1993: 61.

Table 2. Teachers' Preference of Extrinsic Rewards

Of these three, from which do you derive the most satisfaction	1964 Lortie	1984 Kottkamp Provenzo Cohn McCloskey
	%	%
The salary I earn in my profession	14.3	14.2
The respect I receive from others	36.6	26.3
The opportunity to wield some influence	36.0	31.7
I receive no satisfaction at all from these	13.0	27.8

Source: Adapted from M. Cohn and R. Kottkamp. Teachers: The Missing Voice in Education. 1993, and D. Lortie. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. 1975.

Table 3. Main Reasons for Which Teachers Keep Teaching

What are the three main reasons you are presently still teaching?	1981 %	1986 %	1991 %
Desire to work with young people	69.0	62.6	62.4
Value or significance of education in society	37.6	34.4	41.7
Job security	33.2	28.9	30.7
Long summer vacation	37.1	36.1	30.3
Interest in subject matter field	39.3	26.2	25.1
Sense of freedom in my own classroom ...	[1]	15.7	16.8
Need for second income	17.5	17.1	14.0
Opportunity for self-growth	16.6	12.1	11.8
Never really considered anything else	10.9	8.3	8.0
Financial rewards	9.8	5.9	6.4
Influence of a teacher in elementary and secondary school	5.9	4.2	4.8
One of the few professions open to me ...	[2]	5.2	3.4
Need for income after termination of marriage	2.7	3.1	3.0
Influence of family	4.4	3.8	2.8

Source: NEA. Status of the American Public School Teachers. 1982; NEA. Status of the American Public School Teachers. 1987; NEA. Status of the American Public School Teachers. 1992.

[1]Not asked in 1981
[2]Not asked in 1981

Table 4. Public School Teachers with Second Jobs in 1988

Teachers with Another Employment	Male	Female	Total
School year only	8.8	3.8	12.6
Summer only	10.5	5.5	16.0
All year	18.6	4.9	23.5
Total	37.9	14.2	52.1

Source: Adapted from Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1992: 150/Table: 232.

Table 5. Starting Salaries of Public School Teachers and Private Sector Employees

Position	1975	1980	1986	1991
Teaching	8,233	10,764	16,500	21,542
Engineering	12,744	20,136	28,512	34,236
Accounting	11,880	15,720	21,216	27,924
Sales-marketing	10,344	15,936	20,688	26,580
Business adm.	9,768	14,100	21,324	26,256
Liberal arts	9,312	13,296	21,060	25,560
Chemistry	11,904	17,124	24,264	29,700
Math-statistics	10,980	17,604	23,976	29,244
Economics-fin.	10,212	14,472	22,284	26,424
Computer sci.	(NA)	17,712	26,172	30,924

Source: Adapted from Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1992: 151/Table: 234

Table 6. The Kinds of Students Teachers Prefer to Teach

If you could choose your students in the coming year, which of the following would you select?	1964 Lortie %	1984 Kottkamp Provenzo Cohn McCloskey %
Students whose emotional needs are a challenge to the teacher	6.0	3.0
"Nice kids," from average homes, who are respectful and hard-working	36.2	46.6
Creative and intellectually demanding students, who call for special effort	40.0	27.9
Underpriviliged students from difficult or deprived homes for whom school can be a major opportunity	12.2	13.5
Students of limited ability (sometimes called "slow learners") who need unusual patience or sympathy	5.7	9.0

Source: M. Cohn and R. Kottkamp, Teachers: The Missing Voice in Education, 1993; Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn, "Stability and Change in a Profession: Two Decades of Teacher Attitudes, 1964-1984," Phi Delta Kappan, April 1986, v67, n8.

Table 7. The Most Satisfying Intrinsic Rewards of Teachers

Which of the following is the most important source of satisfaction to you?	1964 1 Lortie %	984 Kottkamp Provenzo Cohn McCloskey %
The opportunity teaching gives me to study, read, and plan for classes	3.4	1.9
The chance that teaching offers me to develop mastery of discipline and classroom management	1.1	1.4
The times I know I have "reached" a student or group of students, and they have learned	86.2	86.7
The chance to associate with children or young people and to develop relationship with them	7.9	7.6
The chance that teaching gives me to associate with other teachers, educators	1.0	0.7
I receive no satisfaction from these	0.3	1.6

Note: Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding
Source: Adapted from D. Lortie. Schoolteacher. 1975; M. Cohn and R. Kottkamp. Teachers: The Missing Voice in Education. 1993.

Table 8. Components Teachers Would Like to Change to Improve Their Effectiveness.

Components	Number of Times Mentioned
Better facilities	25
Smaller classes	18
Less clerical, extra duty	17
Curricular improvement	14
Fever interruptions	13
Better students	11
More time for basic subjects	9
Fewer sections	8
Miscellaneous time factor	8
Longer school schedule	7
Improved administration	7
Better parents	7
Changes in self	7
More autonomy	3
Others	4
Total	154

Source: Adapted from Dan Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study, 1975: 182.

Table 9. Components Teachers Would Like to Change to Improve Their Satisfaction with Teaching.

Components	Number of Times Mentioned
More money, promotion	21
Less clerical, extra duty	18
Smaller classes	15
Better facilities	10
More time for basic subjects	8
Better profession	7
Improved administration	6
Better parents	6
Better students	5
Miscellaneous time factor	5
Fever sections	4
Curricular improvements	4
More autonomy	4
Changes in self	3
Others	4
Total	120

Source: Adapted from Dan Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study, 1975: 182.

Table 10. Occupations of Teachers' Fathers in 1910*

Father's Occupation	Men Teachers	Women Teachers
	%	%
Professionals**	25	17
Businessmen	21	28
Artisans	27	30
Laborers	23	21

*Teachers from farm background excluded

**Includes public officials

Source: Data from Lotus Delta Coffmann, The Social Composition of the Teaching Population, New York: Teachers College Press, 1911: 73, as reported in Rury, 1989: 32

Table 11. Social Origins of Teachers in the 1950s

	Wattenberg, et. al. (1957) Michigan (N=240)	McGuire & White (1957) Texas (N=150)	Carlson (1960) Bay Area (N=304)	Pop. Est.
Social Origins	%	%	%	%
Upper Class		2	4.4	2
Upper Middle Class	23	35	16.7	10
Lower Middle Class	23	45	47.3	31
Working Class	37	19	32.7	57

Source: Social class categories and general population estimates for each category are adapted from Richard O. Carlson, "Variation and Myth in the Social Status of Teachers," Journal of Educational Sociology, v35 (Nov. 1961), pp11-113. Carlson took these categories and figures from Robert J. Havighurst and Bernice L. Neugarten, Society and Education (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1957), p18. They were meant to be representative of "communities with population from 5,000 to 100,000" at that time;" as reported in John Rury, "Who Became Teachers?" in Donald Warren (Ed.), American Teachers, 1989:38.

Table 12. Ethnic Background of Teachers-1

Ethnic Group	1971 %	1981 %	1986 %	1991 %
African American	8.1	7.8	6.9	8.0
White	88.3	91.6	89.6	86.8
Other	3.6	0.7	3.4	5.3

Source: NEA. Status of the American Public School Teacher. 1992.

Table 13. Ethnic Background of Teachers-II.

	Ethnicity		
	White	African American	Hispanic
Total	2,050,000	190,000	67,000

Source: Adapted from Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1992: 150/Table: 232.

Table 14. Teachers' Preferences of Rewards by Their Ethnic Background

What are the three main reasons you are presently teaching?	Minority Teachers %	White Teachers %
Value or significance of education in society	50.6	40.9
Financial rewards	3.7	7.0
Need for second income in family	8.0	14.0
Need for income after termination marriage	0.6	3.3
Sense of freedom in my own classroom	13.6	17.3

Source: NEA. Status of the American Public School Teacher. 1992.

Table 15. Gender Groups Among Teachers

	1961 %	1971 %	1981 %	1991 %
Female	68.7	65.7	66.9	72.1
Male	31.3	34.2	33.1	27.9

Source: NEA. Status of the American Public School Teacher. 1992

Table 16. Teachers' Preference of Rewards by Gender

What are the three main reasons you are presently teaching?	Male %	Female %
Value or significance of education in society	41.5	42.0
Financial rewards	5.7	6.7
Job security	34.4	29.6
Need for second income in family	0.6	19.5
Need for income after termination of marriage	0.9	3.7
Opportunity for a lifetime self-growth	8.6	12.9
Sense of freedom in my own classroom	17.2	16.7

Source: NEA. Status of the American Public School Teacher. 1992

Table 17. The Indicators That Good Teachers are Most Likely to Use in Judging Their Effectiveness

How do good teachers, in your opinion, gauge the effectiveness of their teaching? Which of the following is the good teachers most likely to rely on?	1964 Lortie %	1984 Kottkamp Provenzo Cohn McCloskey %
Reactions of other teachers familiar with their work and students	11.7	16.3
Opinions expressed by students generally	7.4	11.1
General observations of students in light of the teacher's conception of what should be learned	58.9	37.3
Assessments made by the principal	2.9	6.0
Assessments made by a "supervisor" or a similar person	1.2	2.8
Results of objective examinations and various other tests	13.4	18.6
Reactions of students' parents	1.2	2.7
Other	3.3	5.3

Source: Adapted from Robert B., E. F. Provenzo, and M. M. Cohn, "Stability and Change in a Profession: Two decades of Teacher Attitudes, 1964-1984," Phi Delta Kappan, v67, n8, April 1986; M. Cohn and R. Kottkamp, Teachers: The Missing Voice in Education. 1993.

Table 18. Teachers' Views of Assessing Their Own Effectiveness

Some teachers think they can assess how their teaching is going. Others feel that it is very difficult. What do you think?	1964 Lortie %	1984 Kottkamp Provenzo Cohn McCloskey %
It is possible to know one's own effectiveness *at times*	48.7	43.9
It is relatively easy to know when one is really teaching effectively	45.6	52.2
It is *relatively difficult* to know when one is really teaching effectively	5.6	4.1

Source: Adapted from Robert B. Kottkamp, E. F. Provenzo, and M. M. Cohn, "Stability and Change in a Profession: Two decades of Teacher Attitudes, 1964-1984," Phi Delta Kappan, v67, n8, April 1986; M. M. Cohn and R. B. Kottkamp, Teachers: The Missing Voice in Education. 1993; Dan Lortie, Schoolteacher. 1975.